Aleksandr Men as an Interpreter of the Bible

Creating Divine-human Culture with the Biblical Theologies of Sergei Nikolaevich Trubetskoi and the 'Russian School'

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Theology at the University of Oxford.

By Daniel Mullaney, Wycliffe Hall, Trinity 2019.

Short Abstract: Aleksandr Men as an Interpreter of the Bible: Creating Divine-human Culture with the Biblical Theologies of Sergei Nikolaevich Trubetskoi and the 'Russian School'. (A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Theology at the University of Oxford by Daniel Mullaney, Wycliffe Hall, Trinity 2019)

Despite considerable interest from various quarters in the assassinated Soviet priest-theologian Aleksandr Men (1935-1990), there has been little attempt to assess his contribution to theological thought. This thesis argues that his principal contribution is as an interpreter of the Bible and biblical theologian in the 'Russian school' tradition, whose theology offers a way of overcoming divisions between secular and sacred spheres in an eschatological 'divine-human culture'.

A methodology for reading Men's 'works' is established using the details of his biography and published works. From this it is clear that interpreting the Bible was Men's principal theological and pastoral concern, central to his many other interests. In developing a biblical theology based on 'Russian school' ideas he bridged the traditional Eastern 'distance' between dogmatic theology and exegetical commentary through hermeneutics and critical study. This makes the relationship between Men's interpretive principles and the under-researched principles of the broader Russian Orthodox tradition productive, but not straightforward.

Men's biblical theology is helpfully considered alongside that of Sergei Trubetskoi, who interacted with Vladimir Solov′ev's philosophy ('divine-humanity', 'all-unity') and Adolf von Harnack's views on dogma and biblical history. Unpublished letters from Trubetskoi to Harnack show how his Solov′evian responses to the latter crystallised Trubetskoi's

christological, biblical and philosophical thinking. Men's contribution to Russian Orthodox Biblical Studies includes his development and use of Trubetskoi's currently little-known biblical thought. Their philosophical inheritance from Solov′ev, views on the linear nature of biblical history, the concrete personal content of the 'God-man' Jesus Christ and their rejection of 'sophiological' thinking, lead both to interpret the 'ecclesiality' of the Russian Church similarly. The 'divine-human culture' that stands at the end of biblical salvation history becomes an eschatological reconciliation of the secular and sacred spheres. This stands as a challenge to all Christians, especially well expressed through artistic interpretations of Scripture.

Long Abstract: Aleksandr Men as an Interpreter of the Bible: Creating Divine-human Culture with the Biblical Theologies of Sergei Nikolaevich Trubetskoi and the 'Russian School'. (A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Theology at the University of Oxford by Daniel Mullaney, Wycliffe Hall, Trinity 2019)

Following his assassination, Russian Orthodox priest-theologian Aleksandr Men (1935-1990) has frequently been recognised (by Vladimir Putin. Patriarch Kirill and many others) as one of the most significant religious figures of the late-Soviet period. Called 'the missionary to the tribe of the Soviet Intelligentsia' by theologian Sergei Averintsev, he has been the subject of many Russian-language articles, books and lectures. Characterisations of his life and work have, however, been highly conflicted. Some, indignant at his engagement with Western theology and 'liberal' 'Russian school' trends, have portrayed him as a dangerous 'heretic', while his own 'spiritual children' have portrayed him as a 'saint', their many biographical recollections often resembling hagiography. Few of his works are available in English translation, and although a number of biographies are available in English, only the recent book by Wallace L. Daniel, *Russia's Uncommon Prophet: Father Aleksandr Men and His Times* (DeKalb: NIU Press, 2016), presents us with a fairly comprehensive study of his life and work. Daniel gives an account of his intellectual background, discussing a variety of figures who influenced his writings and pastoral ministry, including Vladimir Solov′ev, Sergei Bulgakov, the Trubetskoi brothers and Nikolai Berdyaev. As a historian, however, his primary intention is not to analyse Men's theology and the details of its connections with ideological source materials.

Men's theological concerns are reflected, however, in his ongoing influence on Russian-language Bible translation. A number of current members of the Russian Bible Society (RBS)

consider themselves his ‘spiritual children’ and Men’s own writings on biblical studies have served as resources for the development of their projects, including the 2011 RBS publication of the Bible in contemporary Russian. Even English-language studies of Russian Bible translation (Batalden) and Russian Orthodox biblical interpretation (Negrov) have drawn significantly on Men’s earlier work in this area, his three-volume *Dictionary of Biblical Studies* and the article *Concerning the History of Russian Orthodox Biblical Studies* in particular. There has, however, been no systematic analysis in English of Men’s contribution to this field. Thus both Men’s connections with his ‘Russian school’ sources and his contribution to Russian biblical studies require further study.

This thesis argues that Men is most helpfully characterised as an interpreter of the Bible and biblical theologian in the ‘Russian school’ tradition. His significant contributions to Russian-language Bible translation and Russian Orthodox biblical interpretation find their roots in the methodologies of the various ‘Russian school’ authors discussed by Daniel, although it is in fact the little-known friend of Vladimir Solov′ev, Sergei Trubetskoi, who takes pride of place among them. Men’s ‘Trubetskoyan’ biblical theology offers a way of overcoming divisions between secular and sacred spheres in an eschatological ‘divine-human culture’. These eschatological ecclesial ideas are also found in the early works of Sergei Bulgakov, which were themselves greatly indebted to Sergei Trubetskoi’s philosophy and biblical theology.

Men acknowledged Vladimir Solov′ev as his ‘teacher’, and it is clear that the philosopher’s *History and Future of Theocracy* stands at the head of later ‘Russian school’ biblical theologies, including Trubetskoi’s *Teaching of the Logos in its History.* Certain conceptions of Solov′ev such as the ‘divine-humanity’, ‘all-unity’, ‘everyman’ and the ‘World Soul’, partly adopted from Schelling’s philosophies, may be found in Men’s biblical theology. Men,

however, like Trubetskoi, rejected sophiology and theocracy, preferring a more cautious, 'scientific' and 'critical' approach to the biblical material. In this, both Men and Trubetskoi came under the influence of the German liberal theologian Adolf von Harnack. As a result, their biblical theologies synthesise certain Solov′evian dogmatic and philosophical ideas with Harnack's critical 'scientific' and historical acumen.

Of the later developments in 'Russian school' thought, Men viewed Anton Kartashev's views on biblical isagogics very positively, and drew on Sergei Bulgakov for interpretations of Genesis 1-3 and Revelation, especially the millennial kingdom. This eschatological realisation of human history is identified with 'divine-human culture' in the present study. Men, however, saw Bulgakov's later work as suspiciously gnostic and too kataphatic, although he had little sympathy with the 'Neo-Patristic synthesis' and the wave of criticism directed towards the 'Russian school' from certain Orthodox theologians in the West.

His general interest in 'Russian school' theology becomes clear in Chapter One, which creates the groundwork for the remainder of the study. It is itself divided into two parts, the first of which considers Men's life and legacy and shows that Men was primarily interested in presenting the Bible and its theology to a variety of Soviet audiences from young people to educated parishioners to the wider world of academia so they might 'encounter' the Person of Christ for themselves. Although for much of his life the opportunities for these activities were limited, the last three years of his ministry proved especially fruitful. His ongoing significance for the RBS and the initiation of its translation projects should be seen in this light: he sought to produce resources to facilitate an 'encounter' with Scripture.

This involved the publication of voluminous written materials, often on underground *samizdat* printing presses. 'Religious histories', such as *Son of Man,* inspired by the 'life of Jesus' genre, were disseminated alongside children's books. His *Dictionary of Biblical Studies,* an academic resource without parallel in the Russian language, was circulated among his followers. In the more 'academic' works, he based his hermeneutics and exegesis on an extensive reading of 'Russian school' authors, who were significant precisely because they had provided resources for facilitating 'encounter' with Jesus Christ through Scripture. Nonetheless, his writing style bears little relation to the works of these earlier authors, its more popular style inviting the description 'anti-Soviet propaganda'. Despite the many citations and references in his work, accurately determining the sources for Men's ideas can be challenging and often requires close reading of both his works and those of the various 'Russian school' authors he uses.

This investigation cannot seek to be an exhaustive study of Men's extensive writings on the Bible due to their enormous quantity and variety. The second part of Chapter One therefore establishes a methodology for approaching Men's 'works'. It concludes that five works should form the point of departure for a serious engagement with Men's biblical interpretation and theology: (1) *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life* (6 vols), (2) *Dictionary of Biblical Studies* (3 vols), (3) his anonymous commentary for *The Brussels Bible,* (4) *Isagogics* and (5) *Son of Man.* A comprehensive bibliography (Bibliography 1) for Men's works has been created. A number of other books, such as *Sacrament, Word and Image,* have been cited frequently, and also the articles, *Concerning the History of Russian Orthodox Biblical Studies,* and *In Search of the Genuine Christ*. His lectures, sermons, *besedy* and interviews have secondary significance only, but are used where they serve to illustrate the theme discussed.

Chapter Two considers Men's place in the history of Russian Orthodox biblical interpretation. It begins by discussing written responses from two Orthodox priests, Vladimir Volgin and Dmitrii Predein, to Men's interpretive approach. Then it considers Alexander Negrov's account of the history of Russian Orthodox Biblical Interpretation, and the role of the 'Russian school' and Aleksandr Men in that history. Men himself builds his ideas of divine inspiration on the Solov′evian concept of 'divine-humanity', his isagogic positions find inspiration in a speech by Anton Kartashev and his hermeneutics seek to find consistency with Patristic methodologies. He sympathises with the interpretive approaches of Schleiermacher, Bultmann and Barth, although he relates somewhat dismissively to the 'new hermeneutics' of Heidegger, Gadamer and Ricoeur. In general, comparing Men's own interpretive approach against a 'Russian Orthodox' approach is greatly problematised by the lack of any commonly accepted dogmatic formulation of what constitutes 'Russian Orthodox Biblical Interpretation'. Indeed, Men's own article, as demonstrated by Negrov's study, has become one of the very few influential texts concerned with this question. In his engagement with 'Russian school' and Protestant interpretive theories, especially in precisely how 'christocentricity' is to be applied to the process of interpretation, the distinction between exegetical commentary and dogmatic theology can at times be blurred.

In his article *Concerning the History of Russian Orthodox Biblical Studies,* Men outlines four principles for Russian Orthodox biblical interpretation: the Patristic, Divine-human, Ecclesial and Polysemantic Principles. His own application of these principles is analysed in the second part of Chapter Two. Although these principles seem at first glance to be consistent with the 'Russian Orthodox' approach of his critics, his application of the Divine-human principle to allow space for critical reflection on the 'human' aspect of the scriptural text, his

disassociation of the Patristic and Ecclesial Principles and his sympathetic use of unusual 'Fathers', such as Origen and Theodore of Mopsuestia, all have the potential to court controversy. This analysis demonstrates the extent of his dependence on various 'Russian school' authors in applying these principles in his 'works'. That he draws on these 'Russian school' authors at all will undoubtedly create suspicion in certain quarters of the Orthodox Church, yet at the same time his critics tend to overestimate the stability of Russian Orthodox interpretive procedures as they have historically been practised. Rejecting Men's interpretations and biblical theology on the basis of perceived inconsistency with the principles of 'Patristic' biblical interpretation therefore seems disingenuous.

Having considered Men's interpretive principles in the light of the principles of the Russian Orthodox Church, Chapter Three provides a more detailed analysis of Men's biblical theology in the light of Sergei Trubetskoi's thought. Sergei Trubetskoi is relatively poorly known in the West and English-language materials concerned with his life and work are extremely limited. Therefore 3.1 takes the opportunity to give a brief introduction. This leads into a discussion of Trubetskoi's correspondence with Harnack. To consider this adequately, recourse to archive materials has been necessary: Trubetskoi's four letters to Harnack are published for the first time with English translation as Annex 2 to this study. Men's own detailed reading of Harnack's *Outlines of the History of Dogma* during his period of study in Irkutsk raised a number of questions for him, and it seems it is to Sergei Trubetskoi that he turned for answers. Although it is unlikely that Men read Trubetskoi's correspondence with Harnack, he certainly knew of its existence and an analysis of its principal theological themes helps to illustrate how Trubetskoi's later biblical theology, set out in *Teaching of the Logos,* responds to Harnack's thought. 3.4 gives a comparative analysis of the approaches of Trubetskoi and Men first to Old Testament interpretation and then to interpreting the Gospel

accounts of Christ. Men is especially enamoured with Trubetskoi's analysis of Messianism, and what he considers to be Trubetskoi's 'realized eschatology'. Positive assessments of the origins of dogma and the theological nature of Christ's Person as 'God-man' set Trubetskoi apart from Harnack. Trubetskoi's own 'concrete idealist' philosophy explicates the concrete content of Christ's Person and its role as the full revelation and realisation of history. The epistemological role of 'faith' in this system also serves as a clear inspiration for Men.

Trubetskoi rejects Solov′ev's somewhat speculative 'sophiology' in favour of subjugating it to a 'logology'; this he does on the basis of an analysis of the biblical use of the term. Parallels with Men's later rejection of Bulgakov's sophiology are clear. Both thinkers see such dogmatic sophistications as unnecessary. For both Trubetskoi and Men, divine wisdom is one of the unifying themes of Scripture alongside notions of covenant and the Kingdom of God. It helps provide coherence to the scriptural narrative and helps us to understand the nature of the Logos, incarnated in Jesus Christ. Thus this is not a wholesale rejection of sophiology *per se.* Bulgakov's early thought, indeed, has much in common with Trubetskoi's thinking, especially in terms of the biblical theology and philosophical views it espouses. Two other points connect Trubetskoi and Bulgakov. First, Trubetskoi's tendency to hold up the history of philosophy and theology as a mirror to the problems of the present finds parallels both in Bulgakov's *Two Cities* and Men's 'religious histories', especially *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life.* Second, the ecclesial implications of Trubetskoi's application of 'all-unity', in which Men sees an embryonic 'noosphere', lie behind much of Bulgakov's early work on the creation narrative and apocalyptic literature. Significantly, Bulgakov's interpretations of these passages remain relatively consistent throughout his life. They provided material for Men's own extensive discussions in *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life.*

Chapter Four builds on the previous chapters by analysing how Men used art to interpret the Bible. The chapter takes as its point of departure Florensky's statement that the Orthodox liturgy is "a synthesis of the arts". Men's interest in sacred artistic portrayals of biblical events in iconography and the liturgy was substantial and should be considered prior to a discussion of his diverse interests in secular art. Nonetheless, sacred and secular forms are related in continuum. Men, it seems, viewed world culture as a conditional state of affairs awaiting transformation through 'encounter' with the Person of Christ. The use of artistic expression in his pastoral ministry moves towards a realisation of the millennial kingdom as an expression of the noosphere. Artistic interpretations of scripture have apologetic value, because they have high ontological valency, and the Romantic notion of 'genius' gives a way of understanding how art created by humans made in the Image of God may be said to reveal divine truth. Men is closer to Schleiermacher than Gadamer in his hermeneutics of art, although he is far from both in his eschatological views.

The second part of Chapter Four considers Men's fascination with literary portrayals of Jesus Christ using the article *In Search of the Genuine Christ.* Men's own attempt at this kind of portrayal in *Son of Man*, like Zefirelli's film *Jesus of Nazareth,* depicts a Christ without idiosyncratic human mannerisms and follows the Gospel accounts closely. Such an approach may be criticised for portraying a contentless Christ or a non-Person. Yet Trubetskoi's account of the Person of Christ, which draws on his 'concrete idealist' philosophy, enables Men, in his discussions of Renan, Schweitzer and Tolstoy, to demonstrate how and why Jesus Christ should be seen not simply as a teacher or prophet, but 'God-man'. Art, including literary art, provides a way of going beyond mere philosophical and theological debate, but only if artistic form is related to 'divine-human' theological content. Thus 'divine-human' art

is genuinely capable of overcoming the divide between sacred and secular spheres and in so doing establishes a ‘divine-human culture’, something realised eschatologically.

To summarise, Men’s contribution to theology may be found in the way he integrated ‘Russian school’ ideas to interpret the Bible and create a biblical theology. His biblical theology has a universalising tendency that looks towards an eschatological realisation of Solov′ev’s ‘all-unity’ through the revelatory encounter of postlapsarian creation with the Person of Christ. Sergei Trubetskoi’s biblical theology and philosophy play an influential role in the development of Men’s ideas, and in introducing us in his writings to a ‘Trubetskoyan’ biblical approach to Orthodox theology, Men offers an unfamiliar and challenging account of what it means to be Orthodox and Christian.

Acknowledgments

I first encountered the books of Aleksandr Men while working with the Russian Baptist Church in Novosibirsk, Russia in 2006. At the time, I was intrigued that a Russian Orthodox writer should be read keenly by Russian Baptists and his books should be sold in the Russian Baptist bookshop. I asked which book to start with and was presented with a copy of *Son of Man,* which I duly purchased. I rather liked it. After *Son of Man,* which was the first book I read in Russian, I read quite a few of his other works, and found them to be both very interesting on a personal level, and very helpful in conducting Russian-language Christian ministry. I was very surprised at the breadth of the topics he discussed, and even more surprised at the centrality of the Bible in his thinking. Yet at the same time he was not a 'Protestant in Orthodox clothing'. His use of the Bible piqued my curiosity.

Some ten years later, while training for ordination in the Church of England, the opportunity arose to study theology at doctoral level, and I was immediately sure that I wanted to investigate the works of Aleksandr Men just a little further. Thus the present study was born.

In this endeavour I would like to thank first of all those who introduced me to Aleksandr Men back in 2006, missionaries Trevor Warner and Russell Phillips, as well as Pavel Togobitsky of Novosibirsk Russian Baptist Seminary, who demonstrated to me the value of studying Russian Orthodox thought while remaining a convinced Protestant (even though he was more enthusiastic about Alexander Schmemann!) I would like to thank my parents, Jane and Philip Mullaney for their support during the process of study, for reading drafts and helping with various suggestions. I would like to thank my uncle, John Saxelby for all kinds of practical support.

I would like to thank various members of the three communities I was part of at different points during our years in Oxford: Wycliffe Hall (especially the students of Room 15), St. Matthew's and St. Ebbe's. I greatly valued the conversation and consumption of large quantities of coffee.

I would also particularly like to thank my supervisor, Prof. Johannes Zachhuber for supervising a number of essays I have written on theological themes, but most of all for his support during the process of writing this doctoral study. He gave many valuable insights concerning how to approach the extremely varied material produced by Aleksandr Men in an insightful, but focussed manner, and encouraged me to investigate the intriguing link between Aleksandr Men and Sergei Trubetskoi.

Finally, I would also like to thank my wife Anna and children Elizaveta, and Alexey for their patient support and encouragement during my studies. My wife Anna, like many Russian Christians of all denominations, is also an enthusiastic fan of Aleksandr Men.

Short Abstract ii

Long Abstract iv

Acknowledgments xiii

Contents xv

Introduction 1

1) Who was Aleksandr Men? 1

2) Interpretation of the Bible in Russian Orthodoxy 6

3) Creating Divine-human Culture with Biblical Theologies 8

4) Methodology and Structure of the Argument 10

5) Summary 18

1) Contextualising Aleksandr Men's Biblical Interpretation 20

1.1) Aleksandr Men's 'Life' and 'Legacy' 22

1.1.1) An Alternative Childhood in Stalin's Russia 25

1.1.2) Covertly Studying Philosophy, Theology and Biblical Criticism at the Institute of Fur 28

1.1.3) Pastoral Ministry as Book Smuggling and Clandestine Bible Study 30

1.1.4) Aleksandr Men Unleashed 35

1.1.5) Aleksandr Men's 'Legacy' 37

1.1.5.1) A Brief History of Russian Bible Translation 38

1.1.5.2) Valentina Kuznetsova (1948-) and Sergei Averintsev (1937-2003) 43

1.1.5.3) Aleksandr Men's 'Liberal Protestant' Critic Sergei Lezov (1954-) 51

1.1.6) Summary 55

1.2) Understanding the Nature of Aleksandr Men's 'Works' 58

1.2.1) Categorising Aleksandr Men's 'Works' according to Genre 59

1.2.2) Periodisation of Aleksandr Men's 'Works' 63

1.2.3) The Themes of Aleksandr Men's Most Significant 'Works' 71

1.2.4) Summary 77

1.3) General Summary 78

2) Aleksandr Men and 'Russian Orthodox' Biblical Interpretation 80

2.1) Perceptions of 'Russian Orthodox' Biblical Interpretation 82

2.1.1) Russian Orthodox Assessments of Men's Biblical Interpretation 82

2.1.1.1) Vladimir Volgin 83

2.1.1.2) Dmitrii Predein 87

2.1.2) A Historical Account of 'Russian Orthodox' Biblical Interpretation 90

2.1.3) Divine Inspiration, Isagogics and Hermeneutics 96

2.1.3.1) Divine Inspiration 96

2.1.3.2) Isagogics 101

2.1.3.3) Hermeneutics 103

2.1.4) Summary 108

2.2) Aleksandr Men's Four Principles for Russian Orthodox Biblical Interpretation 109

2.2.1) The Patristic Principle 110

2.2.2) The Divine-human Principle 118

2.2.3) The Ecclesial Principle 125

2.2.3.1) The Old Testament Church 126

2.2.3.2) The Eucharist 131

2.2.4) The Polysemantic Principle 135

2.2.5) Summary 140

2.3) General Summary 143

3) Aleksandr Men's Biblical Theology in Light of the Philosophical and Theological Thought of Sergei Trubetskoi (1862-1905) 146

3.1) Characterising Sergei Trubetskoi's Thought 149

3.2) Aleksandr Men's Reading of Adolf von Harnack's Biblical Thought 152

3.3) Sergei Trubetskoi's Polemic with Adolf von Harnack 158

3.4) Aleksandr Men's Accounts of Sergei Trubetskoi's Biblical Thought in *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life* and *Dictionary of Biblical Studies* 170

3.4.1) On Sergei Trubetskoi's Christocentrism and its Implications for Biblical Interpretation 172

3.4.2) The Old Testament and Messianism in Sergei Trubetskoi's *Teaching of the Logos* 175

3.4.3) Christology and Realized Eschatology in Sergei Trubetskoi's *Teaching of the Logos* 183

3.4.4) Aleksandr Men's Divine-human account of Jesus Christ in *Son of Man* 192

3.5) The Philosophy of Sergei Trubetskoi and Aleksandr Men 194

3.5.1) Sophiology and Logology 195

3.5.2) Greek Thought and Concrete Idealism 208

3.6) Creation and Eschatology 217

3.6.1) The Creation Narrative, the Identity of Adam and the Nature of the Fall 219

3.6.1.1) The Fall 222

3.6.1.2) The Term 'Adam' and its Implications for Redemption 226

3.6.2 Revelation (the Apocalypse) 229

3.7) General Summary 239

4) Aleksandr Men and Artistic Approaches to Biblical Interpretation 243

4.1) Tracing the Relationship between the Liturgy and
Secular Art in Biblical Interpretation 244

4.1.1) The Liturgy as a Synthesis of the Arts 244

4.1.2) Secular Art as Biblical Interpretation 250

4.1.3) The Hermeneutic Implications of Biblical Interpretation in Art 256

4.2) Art as Literature in Biblical Interpretation 261

4.3) General Summary 269

Conclusion 273

Bibliography 1: The Works of Aleksandr Men 282

1.1) Books 284

1.2) Articles 301

1.3) Interviews 329

1.4) Lectures 339

1.5) *Besedy* 356

1.6) Sermons 373

1.7) Correspondence 376

1.8) Other 383

1.9) General Bibliography for Volumes by Aleksandr Men 387

Bibliography 2: General Bibliography for all Works except those of Aleksandr Men 396

Introduction

1) Who was Aleksandr Men?

It is clear from the ever-increasing volume of publications in Russia and elsewhere in the twenty-nine years since his death that Aleksandr Men (1935-1990) is a figure unlikely to be forgotten. He has gained attention far beyond that given to most Russian Orthodox parish priests of the Soviet period. His books have been translated into many languages,[1] even though not much of his work is currently available in English. A series of lectures dedicated to his legacy is held near Moscow each year, and both Patriarch Kirill and Vladimir Putin have sent greetings to this event,[2] remarking on his contribution to the spiritual life of Russia. Despite this attention, there has been little attempt to scrupulously analyse what Men's contribution to the life of the Church actually was. Competing narratives attempt to explain either his fame or notoriety, depending on the viewpoint of the author.

Conservative commentators have weighed his rather complex worldview against a dogmatic framework, leading to attack and defamation, with Men being termed a 'heretic' by certain individuals.[3] For such commentators the pejorative use of this term and others such as 'modernist',[4] are intertwined with certain aspects of his thought, such as his 'evolutionism' and his 'ecumenism'.[5] While Men certainly was both an 'evolutionist' and an 'ecumenist',

[1] *Son of Man* has been translated into sixteen languages: Книга протоиерея Александра Меня «Сын Человеческий». Сергиев Посад: Дубрава, 2015, 17-21: https://radubrava.ru/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/son-of-man.pdf [Accessed 20/04/2018].

[2] A message from Patriarch Kirill to the organisers of the Fifth Aleksandr Men Lectures in 2010 is at https://www.pravmir.ru/v-menevskie-chteniya-protoierey-aleksandr-men-i-ego-vremya/ [Accessed 22/05/2019] and Vladimir Putin's greetings to the Tenth Aleksandr Men Lectures in 2015 are at https://www.newsru.com/religy/10sep2015/putin_menj.html [Accessed 22/05/2019].

[3] For Daniil Sysoev's accusations of heresy, see http://www.blagogon.ru/biblio/725/ [Accessed 07/07/2018]

[4] Вершилло, Р. о. Мень, Александр Вольфович: https://antimodern.ru/Men-alexandr/ [Accessed 19/09/2018].

[5] Буфеев К. Об эволюционистском богословии Тейяра де Шардена и протоиерея Александра Меня, 27/12/2016: http://dsnmp.ru/svyashhennik-konstantin-bufeev-ob-evolyutsionistskom-bogoslovii-teyyara-de-shardena-i-protoiereya-aleksandra-menya/ [Accessed 22/05/2019].

qualities seen positively in different quarters of the Russian Orthodox Church, corresponding accusations of 'Manichaeism'[6] and 'Roman Catholicism'[7] are difficult to maintain on closer acquaintance with his work and ministry.[8] Indeed, the use of such pejorative terms often tells us more about the dogmatic assumptions of the critic than Men's worldview.

Even those who see him as a 'spiritual father' give very divergent and often somewhat uncritical accounts of his primary interests. Was he primarily a pastor, a missionary, an apologete, a theologian or a combination of all of these? Of the labels that have been applied in order to characterise him, 'missionary' has been one of the most prominent. The KGB codename for him was 'missionary',[9] and the term has since been applied both positively ('Missionary to the Soviet Intelligentsia') by Sergei Averintsev[10] and negatively ('Lost Missionary') by Andrei Kuraev.[11] Yet this term seems only to partly characterise his activities when we take into consideration both his context as an ordinary parish priest and his interests in writing and art.[12] The term 'apologete', accorded by Tadeusz Pikus might be closer to the mark,[13] especially considering Men's respect for Patristic apologetes such as Justin Martyr,[14]

---

6 For example, Буфеев К. О возрождении манихейской ереси в эволюционистском богословии протоиерея Александра Меня: https://www.blagogon.ru/biblio/757/print [Accessed 20/05/2019]. See also Sysoev's accusation of Manichaeism.

7 Andrei Kuraev claims Men was really a Uniate Catholic. See Кураев А. Александр Мень: Потерявшийся миссионер: http://ruskline.ru/analitika/2010/09/10/aleksandr_men_poteryavshijsya_missioner/ [Accessed 22/05/2019].

8 Dmitrii Predein believes Men's evolutionism stays within the bounds of acceptable Russian Orthodox doctrine. See Предеин Д.прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как выдающийся православный катехизатор и миссионер второй половины XX века. Одесса: "Астропринт", 2015. 187-214. The same work refutes the charge of 'Catholicism' in a chapter discussing Men's ecumenism, 166-178.

9 Men's KGB codename is mentioned in an interview in Бычков С.С. Хроника нераскрытого убийства. М.: Русское рекламное издательство, 1996, 41: http://imwerden.de/pdf/bychkov_khronika_neraskrytogo_ubijstva_1996_text.pdf [Accessed 22/04/2018].

10 Аверинцев С. Миссионер для племени интеллигентов. - Литературная газета. 4 сент. 1991г.: http://yakov.works/library/13_m/myen/de_aver1991.html [Accessed 22/05/2019].

11 Кураев А. Александр Мень: Потерявшийся миссионер.

12 Discussed in Илюшенко В.И. Отец Александр Мень. Жизнь, смерть, бессмертие. М.: Эксмо книгоноша, 2013. Lists of works read each year by Aleksandr Men are in Масленикова З.А. Жизнь отца Александра Меня. М.: Русслит, 1995. 254: http://krotov.info/library/13_m/as/lennikova_1b.htm, [Accessed 07/07/2018].

13 Pikus, Tadeusz, 'Duchowe oblicze Europy i świata w dziełach Aleksandra Mienia', *Collectanea Theologica 72/3*, 2002, 113-133. See 123-127, which discusses Men's apologetic work.

14 Еремин. А.А. Отец Александр Мень. Пастырь на рубеже веков. М.: «Carte Blanche», 2001. 331-2. Also Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый А-Й. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 601-3.

and his desire to educate and explain the Christian faith using any means at his disposal. In this case, however, the question arises: what kind of apologete? Any thinking Christian wishes to give a careful and intellectually satisfying account of their faith and Men does this extremely well, writing books especially designed for the purpose, such as *The Wellsprings of Religion*.[15] It would be wrong, however, to see Men's writings and lectures as purely instrumental methods for achieving such an apology.

Those of his spiritual children who are prepared to characterise him as a 'saint', such as Ilyushenko and the writers of a so-called 'neo-hagiographical' collection,[16] point beyond this instrumentalism towards something more fundamental. A number of Western commentators have attempted something similar with the term 'prophet'. Thus in Wallace Daniel's excellent recent biography (2016), Men is 'Russia's Uncommon Prophet'[17] and in the less recent English-language anthology of Men's writings edited by Shukman and Roberts,[18] Men's writings are 'prophetic' for the twenty-first century. It is of course true that there is a great deal of social commentary in Men's work that could plausibly be termed 'prophetic', especially in such works as *A Hard Path to Dialogue*.[19] That his social commentary finds parallels in the works of Vladimir Solov′ev and Nikolai Berdyaev does not go unnoticed,[20] and neither does the fact that it is often explicitly inspired by the example of both the Old Testament Prophets and Christ Himself.[21] Thus it is not the social commentary itself that

---

15 Men, Alexander, *The Wellsprings of Religion,* translated Alasdair MacNaughton, (New York, SVS, 2017).

16 Anecdotal writings on Men provide a hagiographical collection: Wehrle, Janet, 'The Life of Alexander Men: Hagiography in the Making: The Alexander Men Memoirs as Hagiography', *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 44, no. 1-4 (1999), pp. 419-446. Also published as 'The Life of Alexander Men: Hagiography in the Making', *Religion in Eastern Europe* 19, no. 3 (1999): pp. 18-42.

17 Daniel, Wallace, *Russia's Uncommon Prophet: Father Aleksandr Men and His Times* (DeKalb: NIU Press, 2016).

18 Roberts, Elizabeth and Ann Shukman (eds.), *Christianity for the Twenty-First Century: The Prophetic Writings of Alexander Men,* (New York: Continuum, 1996).

19 Мень А.прот. Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008.

20 Daniel, Wallace, *Russia's Uncommon Prophet,* especially 81-82, 180-182. See Evdokimov, Michel, *Fr Alexander Men: Martyr of Atheism,* translated Margaret Parry, (Leominster: Gracewing, 2011), 37, 77-8.

21 Hamant, Yves, *A Witness for Contemporary Russia: A Man for Our Times,* translated Stephen Bigham, (Torrance CA.: Oakwood, 1995), 165-9. See Daniel, Wallace, *Russia's Uncommon Prophet,* 177-9.

necessarily provides the core of Men's work, as though he were merely reacting to the societal challenges of his own time, but the biblical and philosophical principles for that same commentary.[22] Nonetheless, this mixture of social commentary, spirituality and biblical scholarship that has been attributed to Men is a somewhat curious combination. Ilyushenko speaks of Men as a 'saint' while at the same time discussing Men's extensive engagement with secular culture. In this way Men is characterised by qualities not frequently encountered together in Russian Orthodoxy, at least in the modern period.

Dmitrii Predein's recent Russian-language study (2015) tries to assess Men as a 'catechiser' with theological interests. This in many ways provides a good synthesis of the pastoral and 'prophetic' aspects of the various characterisations already discussed, while at the same time overcoming some of the polarisation between criticism and praise.[23] He dispassionately considers a number of prevalent themes in Men's theology. Predein, as an Orthodox priest himself, is concerned primarily to assess the various different aspects of Men's theology against Eastern Orthodox doctrine in the manner of Men's critics, but here the result is an apology for the various theological stances that have caused conservative consternation. He even compares the character and size of Men's written contribution to the spiritual life of Eastern Orthodoxy to that of John Chrysostom.[24] In treating Men primarily as a 'catechiser', Predein is doing something quite unusual and important, even though certain methodological questions remain. With the exception of Arturas Lukasevicius, who provided an analysis of Men's views on world religions in 2009,[25] most commentators have seemed reluctant to treat

---

22 This is clear in his six-volume *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life.*

23 Предеин Д.прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как выдающийся православный катехизатор.

24 Predein gave this comparison when presenting his book: https://pretre-philippe.livejournal.com/496578.html [Accessed 22/05/2019].

25 Lukasevicius systematises Men's views by analysing them in comparison with the statements of Vatican II. See Lukasevicius, Arturas, *Aleksandr Men's Approach to the World's Religions: A Critical Evaluation in Light of the Declaration Dominus Iesus,* (Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller, 2007). Lukasevicius has continued his investigations of this aspect of Men's work: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330963228_Evaluation_of_Alexander_Men's_Views_on_Brahmanism_in_the_Light_of_the_Declaration_Dominus_Iesus [Accessed 22/05/2019].

him as a ‘theologian’.[26]

If Men was indeed a ‘theologian’ then what kind of theologian was he? A recent article by Alena Kharko argues that, despite the non-scientific nature of much of Men’s work, he made significant contributions to Russian theological thought in the areas of Russian Orthodox exegesis and biblical science.[27] Given the extensive exegetical and homiletic material produced by Aleksandr Men, this seems a probable hypothesis, especially considering Men’s own characterisation of his thought as ‘evangelical’, meaning ‘Gospel-centred’, rather than implying any ‘crypto-Protestant’ connotations, in a letter to Sr. Ioanna Reitlinger.[28]

Treating Men specifically as a biblical theologian and interpreter is clearly not the only way of approaching his ‘life’ and ‘works’. This study will argue, however, that it does give a productive way of combining the many strands of Men’s phenomenon: his pastoral ministry, apologetics, interest in Russian philosophers, other religions and art. Using the Bible as a way of interpreting culture and offering transformation for it is key to this. Many previous writers, including his most significant biographers Ilyushenko, Maslenikova, Eremin, and Daniel, have emphasised Men’s significance as a ‘cultural’ figure however they have chosen to characterise him. It cannot be denied that there is much truth in this. This study will argue that Men is only really understood as a cultural figure when his biblical theology is taken as the point of departure. Men saw in Jesus Christ, as revealed in the Bible, a transforming power for the whole world, not a power that sought to mark off a ‘sacred’ sphere in

---

[26] Averintsev, Sergei and Felmy, Karl-Christian, ‘Die Russische Theologie seit Peter dem Großen’, in Heinz Ohme and Johann Schneider, *Diskos. Glaube, Erfahrung und Kirche in der neuren orthodoxen Theologie. Gesammelte Aufsätze*, *Oikonomia. Quellen und Studien zur orthodoxen Theologie, 41,* Erlangen 2003, 303: ‘Aleksandr Men war kein im eigentlichen Sinne schöpferischer Theologe’ (trans. “Aleksandr Men was not in the strict sense a creative theologian”).

[27] Харко А. Перспективы исследования богословского наследия о. Александра Меня (1935-1990): разработки прот. А. Меня в области русской библеистики: http://www.alexandermen.ru/readings/2015/sem_harko.html) [Accessed 15/02/18].

[28] The reference is to Men’s 03.11.85 letter to Reitlinger. Умное небо: Переписка протоиерея Александра Меня с монахиней Иоанной (Ю.Н. Рейтлингер). М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008. 309.

contradistinction to the secular world. Hence, not only his response to the challenges of his own culture, but his substantial interest in world religion and the religions of antiquity shown in the volumes of *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life,* and discussed by Lukasevicius, may be explained in this light. World spiritual culture is in the conditional state of waiting to be transformed by the work of the Person of Christ into a divine-human culture, expressed in the Bible by the image of the millennial kingdom (Revelation 20:1-10). Thus treating Men first and foremost as an interpreter of the Bible helps us better understand his views on secular art and comparative religion, which have so far been subject to more substantial discussion than his biblical interpretation.

2) Interpretation of the Bible in Russian Orthodoxy

While such a characterisation of Men contributes to our understanding of his phenomenon, helpfully elucidating his significance, it also throws light on Russian Orthodox Biblical Studies, which is an under-researched area of Russian Orthodox theology. The only English-language treatment of this subject so far was provided by Alexander Negrov, a Russian Baptist, in 2008.[29] The English-language *Russian Bible Wars* by Stephen Batalden and Russian-language account of Rizhskii are specifically concerned with the tortured history of Bible translation in Russia,[30] which may be legitimately considered a subset of the broader interrelated questions of biblical studies. In terms of scope, all of these accounts fall short of the huge volume of writing provided by Men on this matter both in articles such as *Concerning the History of Russian Orthodox Biblical Studies*,[31] and the 1790 articles of his three-volume *Dictionary of Biblical Studies.* It is anticipated that an analysis of Men's

[29] Negrov, Alexander, *Biblical Interpretation in the Russian Orthodox Church: A Historical and Hermeneutical Perspective,* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008).

[30] Batalden, Stephen, *Russian Bible Wars: Modern Scriptural Translation and Cultural Authority,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013) and Рижский М.И. Русская библия: История переводов библии в России. Изд. второе. СПб: Авалон Азбука-классика, 2007.

[31] Мень А.прот. Навстречу Христу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. 309-382.

writings on biblical interpretation will contribute to the further study of Russian Orthodox Biblical Studies, providing creative methodologies for development of the discipline.

Yet it should also be remarked at the outset that analysing Men's writings on biblical interpretation is not straightforward. Predein is correct to treat Men rather like a Church Father of the Patristic period, in the sense that much of his writing was occasioned by the needs of its day rather than a desire to create a systematic theological argument. It often lacks the argumentative clarity of 'academic' literature, and furthermore, it is often necessary to 'read between the lines' in order to establish Men's theological and philosophical influences. Much of his work may legitimately be seen as 'popular' exegesis, yet it is apparent both from the arguments and views presented, as well as from the footnotes in these works, separate articles and his correspondence that the author is drawing on a deep well of theological erudition.

Another curious aspect of Men's written legacy, which is both frustrating and illuminating at the same time, is its tendency to include a huge number of citations from authors writing in all manner of disciplines, from scientists, artists, writers, philosophers, theologians, psychologists, sociologists and historians. His work often gives the impression of a Christian humanist reworking of Soviet Marxist literary genres; it throws all kinds of information at the reader in an attempt to assert a universal 'Christian humanist' worldview over a Marxist one.[32] As a result of this clear methodological correspondence, Men's religious histories have been viewed as dissident anti-Marxist literature by some,[33] although any implication that this is a form of intentional dissidence should be treated with caution. Due to these same

[32] A comparison between the work of Men and, for example, the materials of the 1934 Soviet Writer's Congress, is enlightening: https://www.marxists.org/subject/art/lit_crit/sovietwritercongress/index.htm [Accessed 22/05/2019].

[33] April French argues this, although she is careful to give a broad definition of 'dissidence'. See French, April, 'Spiritual Dissent: The Writings of Father Aleksandr Men as Dissent from Soviet Ideology'. MA thesis, Regent College, Vancouver, BC, 2011.

methodological characteristics, the reader might at times wish that the many ideas with which he engaged be subjected to a little more analysis, rather than arranged as a 'collage'. A fair assessment must accept, however, that the peculiarities of the genre in which he wrote are at least in part demanded by the author's unusual context, his writing for clandestine circulation under a persecuting regime.[34]

All of this makes assessing Men's contributions to biblical science a complicated matter. There is more to his interpretive methodology than an attempt to engage with the requirements of his context. The breadth of Men's citations and interests are not merely determined by curiosity and the practicalities of creating literature that might convince Soviet citizens. He sees universalising tendencies in Scripture following his divine-human biblical theology. The reason for interpreting Scripture is to unleash the power within it capable of transforming the world, and this is a power that does not respect confessional boundaries. Neither does it respect any delineation between sacred and secular pursuits. This universalising tendency problematises how his precise relation to Russian Orthodox Biblical Interpretation may be understood, as will be discussed in Chapter Two.

3) Creating Divine-human Culture with Biblical Theologies

The term 'divine-human' refers to a christological concept of Vladimir Solov′ev, later taken up by other 'Russian school' thinkers and Aleksandr Men. It is an English translation of the term *bogochelovecheskii*, which is lexically related to *bogochelovechestvo* ('divine-humanity') and *Bogochelovek* ('God-man'). This translation has been preferred to other options, because it is both a clear lexical equivalent of the Russian term and avoids any

[34] Mullaney, Daniel, 'Review of Men, Alexander, *The Wellsprings of Religion. Vol. I of the History of Religion. In Search of the Way, the Truth, and the Life.* translated Alasdair MacNaughton. (New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2017).' *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History, 70*(1), (2019), 214-216.

unnecessary distancing. The term *bogochelovecheskii* is easily understood by a Russian reader, just as the term 'divine-human' is easily understood by an English reader; the same cannot be said for the term 'theandric', for example. The phrase 'divine-human culture' is not one that can be encountered in Aleksandr Men's published works; it is 'shorthand' used in the present study to refer to a concept that is clearly important to Men despite the fact that he assigns no fixed vocabulary to it. From one perspective, it may be loosely identified with Pierre Teilhard de Chardin's 'Omega Point',[35] yet it may also be associated with Sergius Bulgakov's discussions of the millennial kingdom.[36] In his lecture *Christianity and Culture* Men speaks of the 'creative impulse' of 'divine-human Christianity'.[37] Thus 'divine-human culture' may be taken for the purposes of this study to represent the convergence of the divine-human creative impulse of Christianity with human culture, only fully realised eschatologically in the millennial kingdom. When used in relation to Men's thought, the term cannot be understood straightforwardly as a synonym of the Russian Orthodox Church as a fixed ecclesial culture, as it is in the work of some other writers.[38] Since it comes about as a result of divine or divine-human action in the world, it is best understood as an act of creation with dynamic sacramental, ecclesial and pastoral implications.

This study argues that the universalising character of Men's biblical theology tends towards the creation of a 'divine-human culture'. The term 'biblical theology' ordinarily refers to a theology that creates a unified theological account of the narrative of Scripture. In Men's

[35] "The link between Teilhard's Omega Point and the idea of theosis brings Teilhardism close to Orthodox thought.... Concentrating as he did on the future of humanity and the universe, Teilhard was in no way an abstract thinker. His truly Christian optimism was shot through with inexhaustible creative energy. His faith in existence and faith in God inspires and instils hope. Everything fine, creative and suffused with love that exists on earth is for Teilhard a sign of the times, a foretaste of the coming transfiguration. He is a prophet of progress, but not false and purely external, but focused on the Kingdom of God. He sees evolution and development of humanity through the eyes of faith." Men, Alexander, *The Wellsprings of Religion,* 325.

[36] Мень А.прот. Читая апокалипсис. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011, 204-5. The millennial kingdom is historical or meta-historical, but distinct from final consummation.

[37] Мень А.прот. Христианство и культура, http://yakov.works/library/13_m/myen/00176.htm [Accessed 22/05/2019].

[38] Иустин (Попович) Челийский. Православная Церковь и экуменизм: https://azbyka.ru/otechnik/Iustin_Popovich/pravoslavnaja-tserkov-i-ehkumenizm/ [Accessed 22/05/2019].

case, this unified theological account, which at its centre is divine-human and therefore sacramental, may be organically expanded further to subsume the conditional significance of world spiritual culture and the ongoing revelatory significance of the Church, which itself is called to transform the world.

4) Methodology and Structure of the Argument

Before embarking on a discussion of Men's contribution to biblical science, it will be necessary to determine how the many primary and secondary literary sources will be used. The present study has sought to engage the abundant published materials rather than conduct new interviews with Men's living associates and spiritual children. One of the challenges in assessing Men's thinking is found in the fact that much of the primary and secondary material has not been read with sufficient care. The first part of Chapter One attempts to contextualise Men's engagement with the discipline of biblical interpretation from a biographical perspective, for which various secondary sources are required. Priority among these has been given to the most substantial Russian-language works of his 'spiritual children', namely those by Maslenikova, Eremin and Ilyushenko. A variety of published sources including online interviews and references in studies by Daniel and Predein have also been used, especially in the section concerned with Men's legacy. The purpose of this discussion is to show that the characterisation of Men as an 'interpreter of the Bible' influenced by 'Russian school' thought is not only plausible, but helpful. It sets the scene for a more involved assessment of Men's works in 1.2, which turns out to be highly problematic, not least because of the large number of pseudonymous and anonymous publications.

The assessment of Men's works uses secondary sources to establish as completely as possible a bibliography (Annex: Bibliography 1). On the basis of this, the works are divided first into

several genres, among which his books and articles are seen as most authoritative. Then they are divided into four creative periods, each with its own set of interests, the second and third of which are most significant for the current study. Finally, as a result, five works are established as key texts: *Son of Man, In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life, Dictionary of Biblical Studies, Isagogics* and Men's commentaries for the *Brussels Bible.* That is not to say that these works are used exclusively - the book *Sacrament, Word and Image,* his correspondence and various articles, especially 'Concerning the History of Russian Orthodox Biblical Studies' are also cited extensively - but these five works may be regarded as the basic sources for the argument of the study. All five works are concerned to a very significant extent with biblical interpretation, and four of the five works cite 'Russian school' authors as authorities on the matter (the exception is the commentaries on the *Brussels Bible,* which allude to 'Russian school' ideas rather than cite their authors specifically). Thus, for all these reasons, the discussion of 1.2 has significant implications for the approach taken in the following chapters, as it gives a new methodology for engaging with Men's works. Indeed, it turns out that many of the works that have been translated into English and French and which are therefore better known outside Russia, are actually relatively insignificant lectures or interviews that Men gave without any preparation. By way of contrast, of the five 'key' works, only *Son of Man* and the first part of *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life* have been translated into English, and neither volume is easy to obtain. For this reason, primary materials are almost always directly translated from the original sources, except in the rare cases where there is a suitable English-language version.

If Chapter One attempts to establish the plausibility of characterising Men as an 'interpreter of the Bible', Chapter Two starts to engage with the question of what kind of interpreter Men was. From which philosophical sources did he obtain his hermeneutical principles?

Numerous commentators, including Predein and Lukasevicius, have felt the need to assess Men's theological thinking alongside established doctrinal formulations. Predein refers to the doctrines of the Russian Orthodox Church, whereas Lukasevicius compares him with the teachings of Vatican II. Taking this kind of approach helps to clearly structure Men's thought, which is unsystematically spread across many works and genres, but in general these doctrinal structures give the impression of superficial imposition. This study takes the view that Men's thought is most helpfully assessed alongside 'Russian school' ideas, especially those of Sergei Trubetskoi, which are significant sources for him, rather than Russian Orthodox or Catholic doctrinal statements. Therefore the method may be termed 'comparative' insofar as it seeks to establish Men's intellectual connections with a discrete body of thought, yet specifically this comparison is designed not simply to assess him against a static set of propositions, but contextualise his ideas in the history of Russian theological and philosophical thought in order to ascertain his precise contribution.

The term 'Russian school', coined by Alexander Schmemann,[39] refers to a group of thinkers who sought to 'go beyond' the Fathers by supplying theology with a conceptual framework derived from Western philosophy.[40] In so doing they sought to reconcile the sacred and secular spheres of Russian culture on the basis of philosophical thought. Vladimir Solov′ev (1853-1900), whose doctrines were undoubtedly controversial from an Orthodox perspective, may be regarded as their figurehead, and his notion of the 'divine-humanity' may legitimately be considered central to the tradition.[41] Men avidly read the works of many members of this group and placed a portrait of Solov′ev above his writing desk, regarding him as his

[39] This term is used in Valliere, Paul, *Modern Russian Theology: Bukharev, Soloviev, Bulgakov: Orthodox Theology in a New Key* (T&T Clark, Edinburgh, 2000), to distinguish between two schools in modern Russian theology, the other being the 'Neo-Patristic School', 1. Valliere himself attributes it to Alexander Schmemann, who used the phrase in 'Role of Honour', *St Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly 2* (1954), 6.

[40] Schmemann, Alexander, 'Russian Theology: 1920-1972, An Introductory Survey,' *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly 16* (1972), 17.

[41] Valliere's discussion of Solov′ev's theology in *Modern Russian Theology* is helpful here. The genesis of Solov′ev's thought is found in works by Bukharev, Khomyakov amd Chaadaev, among others.

'teacher'.[42] Chapters Two, Three and Four use the ideas of different 'Russian school' thinkers, such as Vladimir Solov′ev, Anton Kartashev, Sergius Bulgakov, Pavel Florensky, Nikolai Berdyaev and Evgenii Trubetskoi, as points of reference in both explaining Men's relation to the broader field of Russian Orthodox biblical interpretation (Chapter Two) and Men's use of art as a method of biblical interpretation (Chapter Four), although comparison with Sergei Trubetskoi (Chapter Three) provides the most detailed analysis of Men's biblical thought.

The methodology of Chapter Two could be described as a comparative or contextual study that attempts to both explicate Men's thought using the thought of the 'Russian school' and position him in the context of Russian philosophical thought. The discussion begins, however, by attempting to ascertain Men's position in the history of Russian Orthodox biblical interpretation. This is problematised by the lack of any clear norm for Russian Orthodox biblical interpretative method. In fact Men himself pioneered a historical account of the principles of Russian Orthodox interpretation and in so doing showed them to be discomfortingly dynamic.[43] Those later commentators who reject his engagement with 'Russian school' thought tend to do so with little critical thought concerning either their own principles or the principles they reject. Whether or not Men's account of biblical interpretation is accepted depends very much on whether the analogous 'Russian school' philosophical ideas that he refers to are accepted. Therefore these ideas demand some analysis. Thus both the end of the first part and the entire second part of Chapter Two attempt an analysis of Men's interpretive principles in the light of certain 'Russian school' ideas.

Four principles and their application are central to Men's self-understanding as a Russian

[42] Daniel, Wallace, *Russia's Uncommon Prophet,* 172-3. See also Предеин Д.прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как выдающийся православный катехизатор.... 98-100.

[43] Men's 'Orthodox' interpretive principles are criticised in Петухов А.свящ. К статье прот. А. Меня «К истории русской православной библеистики». М.: Духовные учебные заведения и духовное просвещение в России, 2006: http://lavravcheremushkah.ru/images/articles/public/01-1.pdf, [Accessed 07/07/2018]. Petukhov is especially unenthusiastic about Kartashev's 'new isagogics'.

Orthodox interpreter of the Bible. Of these, two are of particular importance - the christocentric divine-human principle (2.2.2)[44] and the ecclesial principle (2.2.3) - and draw on the notion of ecclesiality (*sobornost'*)[45] to emphasise the polysemantic and universalising nature of the scriptural narrative. This dynamic interpretation of the Russian Orthodox biblical tradition allows him to creatively engage with 'Russian school' ideas to explain the Bible's potential to transform the Soviet culture of his time. In his appeal to the thinkers of the 'Russian school' as legitimate representatives of Russian Orthodox thought, Men begins to undermine the hard boundary between sacred and secular.

The most substantial chapter (Chapter Three) of the present study assesses the biblical theology of Aleksandr Men alongside that of Sergei Trubetskoi (1862-1905), one of Solov'ev's closest friends and perhaps the thinker most closely related to the kind of 'biblical' approach adopted by Men. In the secondary literature on Men there has so far been little analysis of this relationship with a theologian who "set out best of all the foundations of biblical theology",[46] beyond a broad recognition of its existence. Indeed, a comparative study of the biblical theologies and philosophies of Aleksandr Men and Sergei Trubetskoi reveals an embryonic 'biblical' trend within modern Russian Orthodox theology, largely (although not completely) overlooked among the theologians of Paris and New York.[47] Both Men and Trubetskoi developed their ideas from the desire to create a plausible reply to Harnack's

[44] As a translation of богочеловечество, 'divine-humanity', used by Boris Jakim in his translations, has been preferred to other alternatives such as 'Godmanhood' (a common translation used by Florovsky and many others), 'the humanity of God' (Valliere in *Modern Russian Theology*) and 'theandricity' for largely practical reasons. It is the closest English-language lexical equivalent to the Russian, and it is also easily understood by the average English reader (unlike 'theandricity', which has a technical ring to it), just as Богочеловечество is easily understood by the average Russian reader. Summarising Vladimir Solov′ev's application of 'divine-humanity' to biblical interpretation, Men (1935-1990) tells us the following. "In Christ the true Human lives the true God. It is just the same in the Scriptures: its author, a human being, whether a poet or prose-writer, all the same preserves his peculiar characteristics, although the Spirit of God moves on him." See Мень А.прот. Библия и литература М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. 184.

[45] This is another difficult term to translate, first used in philosophical discussion by Aleksei Khomyakov (1804-1860) and later developed by Sergei Trubetskoi (1862-1905). It is here translated as 'ecclesiality'.

[46] Мень А.прот. Русская религиозная философия: лекции. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 84.

[47] In particular, the work of Sergius Bulgakov may be seen as a continuation of these interests.

account of the *History of Dogma.* In Trubetskoi's case, this is most clearly demonstrated by his unpublished letters to Harnack, archival materials that are included with translation as Annex 2. As part of their reply, both paid attention to the connections between the religion of the Bible and the other belief systems of the world in which it arose. Both gave a strongly christocentric and theological account of religious history centred on the revelatory power of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and both supported their ideas with the results of biblical criticism and philosophical conceptions. There are striking parallels between the ways in which Sergei Trubetskoi and Aleksandr Men applied their ideas to the practicalities of social change. Sergei Trubetskoi played a leading role in the events of 1905,[48] and Aleksandr Men was a leading figure in the re-engagement with Orthodox Christianity during the *glasnost'* and *perestroika* period of the late 1980s.[49] Neither were 'cabinet' philosophers or theologians. Neither produced a complete and comprehensive philosophical-theological system (although Trubetskoi's system is the more complete of the two), because both were more interested in the transforming power of the Person of Christ. Universalising tendencies are present in Trubetskoi's thinking, and Men finds in the earlier writer an embryonic 'noosphere', later developed by Vernadskii, and another of Men's favourite thinkers, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin.[50]

In both Chapters Two and Three the relationship between biblical interpretation and biblical theology is discussed at length, because in the thought of the 'Russian school' and Sergei Trubetskoi the traditional delineation between exegetical considerations and doctrinal teachings is blurred. For Men the principles of biblical interpretation result in the formation of a certain kind of biblical theology. Yet this biblical theology itself provides the contours of

[48] Bohachevsky-Chomiak, Martha, *Sergei N. Trubetskoi: An Intellectual Among the Intelligentsia in Prerevolutionary Russia,* (Belmont, Mass.: Nordland Publishing Company, 1976).

[49] Details and pictures of Men's appearances on television and at the Moscow Olympic Stadium in 1990 are in Hamant, Yves, *A Witness for Contemporary Russia,* pp. 202-7.

[50] Trubetskoi's thinking on this can primarily be found in Трубецкой С.Н. О природе человеческого сознания - Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 483-593. For more details see 3.5-6 below.

the interpretive approach and its christocentricity especially gives theological foundation to the divine-human and ecclesial principles. What results may be called a 'hermeneutical circle', with the exegetical details of parts determining the interpretive approach taken to the whole and vice versa, in a developmental process. Art is part of this developmental process, and the discussion of art as biblical interpretation in Chapter Four provides an assessment of one of the clearest applications of Men's interpretive principles. Here the universalising and polysemantic qualities of the ecclesial and divine-human principles are in full view and not only 'Russian school' hermeneutical theories, but those of Gadamer and Schleiermacher, are taken as points of orientation.

We may find in Men's books his own illustrations, well-known works of iconography, Renaissance art, sculpture and nineteenth-century graphic drawings. He saw art, theatre, cinema and music, even in their secular expression, as legitimate, even necessary instruments for the expression of biblical revelation. Although consistent with his 'Russian Orthodox' principles of biblical interpretation, the lack of any significant distinction between sacred and secular art in Men's interpretive vision will surprise anyone familiar with Russian Orthodox thinking on the liturgy and sacred art. While Pavel Florensky focussed his attention on the Orthodox liturgy, describing it as "a synthesis of the arts"[51] and Evgenii Trubetskoi analysed the artistic merits of iconography,[52] Aleksandr Men saw spiritual value in the secular artistic expressions of rock music,[53] the films of Andrei Tarkovsky,[54] the modernist music of Krysztof Penderecki,[55] and the abstract art of the painter Aleksandr Yulikov,[56] whom he employed to

[51] Флорениский П.А. Храмовое действо как синтез искусств – Сочинения в четырех томах. Том 2. М.: Мысль, 1996. 378-382.

[52] Trubetskoi, Evgenii, *Icons: Theology in Color,* translated Vakar, Gertrude, (New York: SVS Press, 1973). A Russian-language version of the three articles is at https://azbyka.ru/otechnik/Evgenij_Trubeckoj/umozrenie-v-kraskah. [Accessed 20.12.2018] or in Трубецкой Е.Н. Смысл жизни / Сост. А.П. Полякова, П.П. Апрышко. М.: Республика, 1994. 223-291.

[53] Илюшенко В.И. Отец Александр Мень. Жизнь, смерть, бессмертие.... 226.

[54] Мень А.прот. Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 159–168.

[55] Мень А.прот., Мир библии – Как читать библию. Часть первая. М: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2005. 20.

[56] 4.1.2.

help illustrate his books. Through artistic expression the universalising potential of the Bible's message may be realised ecclesially. If the 'Russian school' thinkers believed true ecclesiality (*sobornost'*) could erase the hard boundary between sacred and secular, spiritualising everything in its path,[57] Men, in his application of the arts, moved these ideas beyond philosophical discussion. He encouraged his 'spiritual children' not to give up their secular callings, but find a way of expressing biblical truth as personal truth in art. Aesthetics, for Men, did not play an instrumental role as a servant to the Word. Rather, the expressive potential of art provided an alternative means of communication by appealing to the fullness of human nature.

Thus, although Men took ideological inspiration from 'Russian school' attempts to reconcile the secular and sacred,[58] his own work took things further in two ways. His engagement with secular art was far more extensive than that of the 'Russian school' and biblical interpretation and theology were given a far more central role in this reconciliation than in the writings of most 'Russian school' figures. Men's synthesis of the 'evangelical' spirit of the first Russian Bible Society (1814-1826) with the aspirations of the intelligentsia in order to create a open 'evangelical' culture sets his contribution apart from other Russian theologians of a more 'liberal' outlook. While the first Russian Bible Society never really gained traction among the 'intelligentsia' of its time, as Pushkin's cynical comments concerning the 'Bible men' demonstrate,[59] Men was able to count among his friends and followers an astonishing list of 'intelligentsia' personae, including Nadezhda Mandelstam, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, and Maria Yudina.[60]

---

[57] The universalising tendencies of ecclesiality as understood by the 'Russian school' are given philosophical presentation in Трубецкой С.Н. О природе человеческого сознания and also in Bulgakov, Sergius, *The Bride of the Lamb,* translated Boris Jakim, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), especially 253-268.

[58] Men's article 'Encounter' discusses enthusiastically the seminars with both secular and sacred participants organised by Dmitrii Merezhkovskii from 1901-1903: Мень А.прот. Встреча – Русская религиозная философия. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 142-180.

[59] Batalden, Stephen, *Russian Bible Wars,* 85-86.

[60] On Men, Solzhenitsyn and Mandelstam, see Daniel, Wallace, *Russia's Uncommon Prophet,* 112-115. On

These figures of the 'intelligentsia' were to play a key role. Men believed that the sundering of the sacred and secular present before 1917 had been greatly exacerbated by the Soviets,[61] and if Russia was to have a future then this split needed addressing. Post-Soviet Russia could only find its true calling if it was prepared to undergo not only economic, but spiritual restructuring (*perestroika*).[62] A process of engagement between the artists of the Soviet intelligentsia and the Church was to provide a key part of Men's vision for this 'restructuring'. Yet the provision of grounds for a reconciliation of sacred and secular art is not merely a political matter; it is the necessary result of establishing divine-human culture. From the discussion of Men's interpretation of the Book of Revelation (3.6.2) we see that this is portrayed by the eschatological vision of the millennial kingdom of the coming Christ. The future Christian culture presents no division between sacred and secular and the Christian culture of the present looks forward to this primarily in its artistic expression. Thus art provides the example *par excellence* of Men's interpretive principles in action.

5) Summary

This study argues that Men may helpfully be characterised as an 'interpreter of the Bible', who developed his principles from the ideas of the 'Russian school'. His biblical theology demonstrates the universalising tendencies of his interpretive principles, and the final purpose of these tendencies may be seen as a divine-human culture, which is reflected in the divine-human qualities of the art of the present. All cultures, including the spiritual cultures of antiquity and the materialist Soviet culture of Men's own context, are conditional realities

Men and Yudina, see Гамазкова Т. Отец Александр Мень и Мария Вениаминовна Юдина: http://www.doroga-vmeste.ru/2007/2007_3_o_a_men_mv_judina.shtml [Accessed 23/05/2019].

61 Discussed in 'Religion, Personality Cult and Secular Government' (Bibliography 1.2.44): Мень А.прот. Трудный путь к диалогу.... 121-132.

62 Мень А.прот. Трудный путь к диалогу.... 191.

subject to the transforming power of the one true reality, the Person of Jesus Christ. This lies at the centre of Men's theological thinking and ministerial interests, and here he has most in common with the 'Russian school' writer Sergei Trubetskoi, who provided him with a critically astute Orthodox theological account of the Person of Christ. Men's christocentric 'Russian school' approach to biblical interpretation therefore provides a challenge both to the Eastern Orthodox Church and the Churches of the West that any distinction between secular and sacred is merely conditional; all human culture is valuable, but of conditional value. This value can be fully realised only by its transformation through the Person of Jesus Christ into divine-human culture, of which art provides an image.

1) Contextualising Aleksandr Men's Biblical Interpretation

In this case, the principal task is to show that the suggested characterisation of Men as an 'interpreter of the Bible' is not only a plausible, but productive way forward. This discussion therefore proceeds with a contextualisation of his engagement with the discipline of biblical interpretation rather than any other aspects of his phenomenon.

Establishing what is to be contextualised is, however, only half the problem. A second question concerns the context itself: are we speaking of (I) historical and biographical context, or (II) the literary context of his ideas? This chapter will look at these two in succession, as both provide different clues to Men's interpretive priorities and theological sources. The complex issue of Men's relation to Russian Orthodox biblical interpretation is allocated a separate discussion in Chapter Two.

The necessity of the first of these, historical and biographical contextualisation of his thinking, is legitimately unquestioned in the current literature on Aleksandr Men, and as Andrew Louth notes, most writers believe it is impossible to understand Men's writings without an appeal to his Soviet context.[63] 1.1 therefore looks first at how Men's 'life' in the unusual context, for a biblical scholar, of the USSR related to his theological development. Men's 'works' cannot easily be divorced from 'life', but at the same time, his views are not wholly reducible to the demands of his surroundings. In this respect it will be enlightening to give a retrospective view of Men's approach to biblical interpretation from the midst of Post-Soviet debates on Russian-language Bible translation.

[63] Louth, Andrew, *Modern Orthodox Thinkers: From the Philokalia to the Present Day,* (London: SPCK, 2015), 315.

Indeed, after Men's death in 1990, Russian-language Bible translation became one of the key areas where Men's theological legacy is in clear view. This legacy shows the combination of a desire to make the Bible understood as broadly as possible (Kuznetsova), with the inclusion of a significant role for 'Russian school' thinking in establishing interpretive procedures (Averintsev and Seleznev). Lezov's 'Liberal Protestant' critique of Men is especially intriguing as, in its rejection of 'Russian school' theology, it unintentionally emphasises Men's desire to create a new reality based on the Person of Christ, through encounter with Him and resulting cultural transformation.

This section will show how Men's personal intellectual development and theological concerns on the one hand and the demands of his pastoral ministry on the other, coincided, primarily in the explication of Scripture. Although both Men's intellectual development and pastoral ministry may be helpfully contextualised amid the realities of Soviet life, neither of these things were exclusively determined by the demands of his time. Both are reflected equally, if not more so, in his post-Soviet legacy, in the attempts of thinkers to grapple with 'Russian school' hermeneutics, while facilitating understanding of the Bible. Both biographical accounts of Men's 'life' and analyses of his 'legacy' ultimately show that Men's theology, inflected by 'Russian school' thought was 'biblical' first and foremost, and it is this biblical theology, closely related to his interpretive procedures, that stands at the heart of his pastoral ministry and apologetics.

1.2 starts from a consideration of the 'works' themselves and attempts to understand the literary context in which Men's biblical interpretation is presented to us. Unfortunately for us, this is a very complex picture, as can be seen in Bibliography 1. Although a number of

studies have sought to analyse individual works,[64] only one, Predein's monograph,[65] has attempted to systematically analyse his oeuvre as a whole. The present study sees a comprehensive and critical assessment of Men's works as an essential prerequisite for ascertaining the extent and characteristics of Men's theological engagement with biblical studies and interpretation. This section will therefore both demonstrate the extent of Men's interest and his desire to communicate the divine-human narrative of Scripture as broadly as possible. It will also help us understand which sources to prioritise in the remainder of this study.

1.1) Aleksandr Men's 'Life' and 'Legacy'

A detailed account of Aleksandr Men's 'Life' has been admirably realised by Wallace Daniel in his book *Russia's Uncommon Prophet: Father Aleksandr Men and His Times.* The author takes time to reflect on Men's childhood, early education and philosophical reading, as well as state pressure and interrogations. Daniel draws on Zoya Maslenikova's accounts (Maslenikova was Men's editor), as well as Men's own memoirs, published as *About Myself*[66] and various interviews of Men's relatives conducted by the author. In the breadth of material used and analytical stances taken, Daniel's book surpasses earlier and shorter studies available in English by Yves Hamant and Michel Evdokimov,[67] at the same time as offering something distinct from the various, usually rather personal, Russian-language memoirs written by Men's spiritual children, the most substantial of which are by Maslenikova,

---

[64] Eremin discusses *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life* in his Appendix: Еремин. А.А. Отец Александр Мень.... 442-480, and Lukasevicius takes this work and Men's lectures *World Spiritual Culture* as the basis for a study of his views on comparative religion: Lukasevicius, Arturas, *Aleksandr Men's Approach to the World's Religions....* April French, in her unpublished Master's thesis provides discrete discussions of a number Men's works (*Son of Man, The Wellsprings of Religion,* and *How to Read the Bible*), in which they are analysed as examples of political dissidence.

[65] Предеин Д.прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как выдающийся православный катехизатор....

[66] Мень А.прот. О себе... М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2007.

[67] Hamant, Yves, *Alexander Men: A Witness for Contemporary Russia* and Evdokimov, Michel, *Fr. Alexander Men: Martyr of Atheism*.

Ilyushenko, and Eremin. Nonetheless, in characterising Men as a 'biblical theologian' we need to draw attention to two specific areas not discussed by Daniel.

The first of these is Men's intellectual development: Men's notes concerning what he read each year, recorded by Maslenikova at the end of each chapter, and Men's period of doctoral study at the Moscow Theological Academy in the 1960s, rebut claims he was a theological 'amateur'. These things are curiously ignored by all of the most significant English-language sources. Although Daniel does not, unlike some,[68] claim that Men lacked theological education, one might still gain the impression from his biography that Men's theological studies were the work of a 'dilettante'. In Russian, the hagiographical quality of some works by his 'spiritual children' does not allow space for the accentuation of Men's academic qualifications and theological rigour. The Orthodox saint is not usually presented as an academic theologian of the 'school' and certainly not one who applies critical apparatus to Bible study. Predein, in his assessment of Men as a 'theologian', presents a contrasting biographical account: he reflects on how Men drew on the ideas of teachers at the Academy[69] and gained the 'kandidat' qualification in 1969,[70] the lower of two levels of doctoral degree awarded by Russian universities.

Various characteristics of Men's ministry, especially those specific to his context, have tended to obscure the 'theological' qualities of his thought. It is indeed true that he was admitted to the diaconate without any formal training, and despite his later qualifications he was always reticent to use the title 'theologian' to describe himself, preferring 'pastor'.[71] As a parish

[68] Metropolitan Clement of Kaluga and Borovsk notes that many sources make this claim in an interview on behalf of the Publishing House of the Moscow Patriarchate: https://psmb.ru/a/aleksandr-Men-sobranie-sochineniy-v-15-tomah.html [Accessed 30/05/18].

[69] Предеин Д.прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как выдающийся православный катехизатор.... 101-105.

[70] Предеин Д.прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как выдающийся православный катехизатор.... 101.

[71] Мень А.прот. Трудный путь к диалогу.... 96; Мень А.прот. Церковь и мы. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2015, 230; Умное небо, 307.

priest in the Soviet Union, Men had little opportunity for or indeed interest in dogmatic speculation, however educated he may have been. The example of Sergei Bulgakov, condemned in 1935 for what could be called an overly 'creative' engagement in dogmatic theology, stood as a stark reminder of the consequences of having 'interesting' dogmatic opinions. Predein is correct that Men can be characterised as a theologian, but not one dogmatically-inclined. The reasons for this are not, however, a fundamental apophaticism and a lack of interest in the Fathers,[72] but a specific interest in biblical interpretation and biblical theology. Men indeed wrote extensively and lectured on the Fathers as well as the Bible, and he rejected the 'symbolic' approaches to biblical interpretation often related to apophatic language in favour of biblical criticism.

Second, Daniel's biography does not pay much attention to Men's interest in biblical studies despite including relatively detailed discussions of Men's works *Son of Man, In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life,* and Men's lecture series *The Bible and Literature* and *Russian Religious Philosophy.* As a historian he is not primarily concerned to show the extent to which these works relate to the field of biblical studies, nor does he concern himself with other major works wholly related to the discipline, such as Men's *Isagogics, Dictionary of Biblical Studies* and his commentaries for the *Brussels Bible.* There is some discussion of how these works relate to biblical studies in the Russian-language works by Maslenikova and Eremin, which has not been transferred into any English-language accounts.

In giving a brief reconstruction of Men's biography, 1.1.1-4 will seek to remedy these two problematic aspects of the current biographical literature in an attempt to persuade the reader that study of the Bible and promulgation of Biblical Studies was a major area of theological interest for Aleksandr Men, if not the most significant. Although Men was also interested in

[72] Предеин Д.прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как выдающийся православный катехизатор.... 106.

Russian philosophy, art, literature and world religions, it is Biblical Studies that unifies these disparate themes and brings coherence to them. The importance Men allocated to study of the Bible also provides a connecting thread in considering Men's own intellectual development, relating personal and ministerial concerns. A discussion of Men's 'legacy' (1.1.5), which is the natural development of these personal and ministerial concerns, then shows that it is precisely this 'biblical side' of Men's phenomenon that has sparked most controversy and further development among his spiritual children and followers. Once we have established Men's place in the history of Russian-language Bible translation, we shall discuss four biblicists of the post-Soviet period who demonstrate theological connections with Aleksandr Men: Valentina Kuznetsova, Sergei Averintsev, Sergei Lezov and Mikhail Seleznev. Three of these, Kuznetsova, Averintsev and Seleznev, have been closely connected with the work of the Russian Bible Society (RBS), of which Men was among the founding members in 1990. Lezov, once one of Men's parishioners, is a philologist and theologian critical of Men.

1.1.1) An Alternative Childhood in Stalin's Russia

Aleksandr Men was born on 22nd January 1935, shortly before Stalin's Great Terror. It would be understatement to say that this was a difficult time for Orthodox Christians in Russia, with churches closed and exile or execution threatening any active priests or believers. Religious literature, including the Bible, was largely inaccessible. Children receiving any form of religious upbringing or education were very few in number. Men, however, was an exception to the general rule. He was baptised together with his mother Elena in the so-called 'Catacomb Church', an underground and illegal Orthodox Church, by Fr. Seraphim (Sergei Bitiukov) in September 1935.[73] He spent the war in Zagorsk, which before 1917 used to be the Orthodox centre Sergiev Posad, with his mother and brother. After the death of Fr.

[73] Daniel, Wallace, *Russia's Uncommon Prophet,* 35-37.

Seraphim in 1942 and the arrest of Fr. Petr Shipkov, another spiritual father for the family, in 1943, he and his family came under the influence of a certain Mother Maria, the leader of an underground convent.[74] It was not until Patriarch Alexii I's election in 1945, following Stalin's wartime rapprochement with the churches, that members of the Catacomb Church started to rejoin the 'official' Russian Orthodox Church, and things started to get a little easier.

According to Maslenikova's account, Fr. Seraphim had started to systematically introduce Men to the Bible at the age of five.[75] From the age of twelve, Mother Maria encouraged him to read the Bible daily, and a school exercise book from 1948 shows Men attempting to reconcile the Genesis creation narrative with science.[76] By all accounts, Men appears to have been a precocious student, reading the Church Fathers (2.2.1) along with philosophers such as Plato, Spinoza, Kant and Hegel voraciously from the age of fifteen, and enjoying regular concerts at the Conservatoire in Moscow. His interests were broad and this showed in his relation to the philosophy he was reading. Maslenikova remarks that although Men was able to understand and appreciate abstract thought, he was most interested in those philosophers who sought to create a practical way of life, such as Socrates.[77]

Even at this age, it was the biblical texts that provided the backbone of his intellectual development. Christ as portrayed in his favourite books, the Gospels, became far more significant to the teenage Men than the Fathers and Socrates. Indeed, he spoke of his own Christian faith taking on a deeper personal quality at the age of fifteen. It is through his reading of the Gospels as a teenager that Men himself came to have what he called a "living

[74] Daniel, Wallace, *Russia's Uncommon Prophet,* 44.
[75] Масленикова З.А. Жизнь отца Александра Меня, 48.
[76] Масленикова З.А. Жизнь отца Александра Меня, 92-3.
[77] Масленикова З.А. Жизнь отца Александра Меня, 97-8.

encounter" with Christ, perhaps reminiscent of Bonhoeffer's turn from "phraseology to reality".[78]

> For many people this age... becomes the moment when they open up anew what they have learnt from their relatives and teachers. Things which were taken on faith as abstract theory become reality through living personal experience. This turning-point comprises an enormous range of questions, and is particularly important for faith. Whether it becomes a personal experience, whether a person opens it anew for himself, that is the most important thing. Until this happens, until the soul meets God on her path and stretches towards Him, religion will remain for her a system of views, taken on the strength of an unaccountable trust in authority.[79]

Men's personal 'encounter' did not lead, however, to the relinquishment of curious theological and philosophical inquiry, rather the opposite. From 1951 Men devoted himself to the study of commentaries and literature concerned with biblical criticism. In 1951, his reading of Spinoza led him to question the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, then he attempted to write a biblical history based on a reading of the Western authors Renan (4.2) and R. Kittel alongside Russian authors such as Gladkov and Turaev. In 1953, shortly before his admission to the Institute of Fur, he read through Adolf von Harnack's *History of Dogma,* the single-volume edition in Russian translation. This was a substantial volume that he greatly valued, despite not being wholly in agreement with its contents (3.2).[80]

As a child and teenager, Men developed a thorough knowledge of the Bible and some of its most significant interpreters from within his own Orthodox and from the Western philosophical tradition at a time when even possession of such literary sources could have sent the owner to a labour camp. He was unable to study these subjects formally, which is one reason why he has been seen as an amateur by some,[81] but used his spare time well, and

---

78 Letter to Eberhard Bethge from Tegel Prison, 22/04/1944 in Bonhoeffer, Dietrich, *Letters and Papers from Prison,* (London: The Folio Society, 2000), 243.

79 Масленикова З.А. Жизнь отца Александра Меня, 97.

80 Масленикова З.А. Жизнь отца Александра Меня, 113.

81 For example Лезов С.В. Очерки современного православного либерализма – Попытки понимания: избранные работы. СПб.: Университетская книга, 1998.

learnt very quickly with whom he could and could not talk about philosophy and theology. He developed a network of friends, such as the artist and secret theosophist Vatagin, who could converse with him about philosophy and provide him with further material for study.[82] Thus around him a 'micro-culture' formed that insulated him from the cult of Stalin so vigorously promulgated in the schools of the period.

1.1.2) Covertly Studying Philosophy, Theology and Biblical Criticism at the Institute of Fur

In 1953, Men was admitted to the Institute of Fur in Moscow, before his studies were relocated to the Siberian city of Irkutsk in 1955. There he rented a room with another precocious student, Gleb Yakunin, who later became an Orthodox priest and prominent dissident.[83] Together they worked their way through a whole series of proscribed philosophical and theological works, such as those of the Russian religious philosophers: Solov′ev, Berdyaev, Florensky, Bulgakov and the Trubetskoi brothers. Men rejected Florovsky's criticism of these thinkers.

> Protopresbyter G. Florovsky, whose work I read towards the end of my time as a student, described the whole movement [of Russian religious philosophy] as "decadent". He suggested taking Metropolitan Filaret (Drozdov) as a point of orientation, maintaining him to be something close to a new Father of the Church. But his arguments did not convince me in the end. I read a damning character portrayal by the historian S. Solov′ev, and likewise the bare fact that the Metropolitan defended serfdom and corporal punishment in his catechesis decided the matter for me.[84]

This comment is significant in that it shows Men's critical relation to a certain kind of Russian Orthodox theology that subsequently became seen as representative of Orthodox theology in the West. Men's ideological sources became the 'Russian school' thinkers rather than their Parisian critics G. Florovsky and V. N. Lossky. It is from these 'Russian school'

[82] Daniel, Wallace, *Russia's Uncommon Prophet,* 63.
[83] Daniel, Wallace, *Russia's Uncommon Prophet,* 68-70.
[84] Масленикова З.А. Жизнь отца Александра Меня, 139.

thinkers that he borrowed many of his approaches to biblical interpretation, while he at the same time tended to distance himself from their more speculative metaphysical constructions.

As well as taking the opportunity to read, Men got to know a number of Christians from Catholic and Protestant Churches, regularly visiting their services from 1955 onwards. He enjoyed visiting the Catholic Church and appreciated their liturgy. Although his relationship to the Russian Baptist Church was far from uncritical,[85] he appears to have greatly valued the vitality of the Russian Baptist community, their "evangelical, prophetic and moral spirit",[86] and especially their small group Bible studies. Eremin claims that "Fr. Aleksandr borrowed the experience of communal life and group Bible study from the Baptists" when he later came to organise his own small groups at Novaya Derevnya.[87] Men was disappointed by the Baptists' lack of engagement in critical thought, but Daniel's claim that Men thought critical study of the Bible had reached a higher level in the Catholic Church than among Protestants, is inaccurate.[88] "Among other Protestants (Liberals) I found the combination of faith and biblical criticism that I needed so much (incidentally in recent times this combination has gained strength in Catholicism and among the most enlightened representatives of Orthodoxy),"[89] Men tells us. His most fundamental criticism of Protestantism concerned not its practical use of Scripture, nor its engagement with biblical criticism, but its rejection of apostolic succession, which he considered essential for the unity of the Church.

Following his engagement with non-Orthodox Churches and his reading of Russian religious philosophy, Men described a call in 1957 to move away from church-historical problems in order to focus on the Bible.

---

85 Men wrote a brochure criticising the Baptists in 1955: Масленикова З.А. Жизнь отца Александра Меня, 154.
86 Масленикова З.А. Жизнь отца Александра Меня, 137.
87 Еремин. А.А. Отец Александр Мень.... 230-231.
88 Daniel, Wallace, *Russia's Uncommon Prophet,* 75.
89 Масленикова З.А. Жизнь отца Александра Меня, 137.

> ...I clearly heard the call to move over to works directly related to the proclamation of the faith, to the explanation of the meaning of the Bible and the Gospels for people. In those years the Holy Scriptures started to fall into the hands of people more often... and I saw how great the difficulties were for the ordinary person in understanding the Bible, even for the educated, let alone others. The result of this was a volume (400 typewritten pages) with the title *What the Bible speaks about and what it teaches.*[90] The book was thoroughly imperfect, but it became the rough draft and plan for the six-volume *In Search of the Way* and first of all for *Son of Man.*[91]

Thus, it is during the period from 1953-1958 that Men worked out his personal approach to the Bible and biblical interpretation; it was a christocentric approach based on the ideas of the 'Russian school' that would be expressed in *Son of Man* and *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life,* as well as throughout his later ministry. In contrast with the positivity of this time of study and searching, his stay in Irkutsk ended in an unpleasant manner in 1958 when the Institute authorities realised his connections with the Orthodox Church and refused to admit him, an ideological alien, to his final examinations. He was thrown out without any qualifications and had to return to Moscow to a wife and young child with no means of supporting himself.[92] At this point, through a somewhat unusual set of circumstances, he came to be admitted to the diaconate of the Russian Orthodox Church within months.

1.1.3) Pastoral Ministry as Book Smuggling and Clandestine Bible Study

Anatolii Vedernikov,[93] an acquaintance from Men's youth and now the editor of the *Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate,* gave a personal recommendation to Metropolitan Nikolai of Krutitsky and Kolomna that Aleksandr Men be immediately considered for a church appointment. Vedernikov had realised that Men had already gone far beyond the standard seminary course in his own private study, and Metropolitan Nikolai was ready to assent to his

---

90 Bibliography 1.1.2.
91 Масленикова З.А. Жизнь отца Александра Меня, 139.
92 Daniel, Wallace, *Russia's Uncommon Prophet,* 86-89.
93 Men studied icon-painting with Vedernikov's wife Elena. (4.1.1).

suggestion without normal process in the increasingly antagonistic conditions of Khrushchev's rule. Thus, Men was ordained deacon on 1st July 1958 and assigned to a parish in a Akulovo, a village on the south-western outskirts of Moscow.[94]

Upon completing correspondence courses at the Leningrad Theological Seminary, he was ordained priest and sent to Alabino, another village south-west of Moscow, where he remained until 1964 and was largely given free rein in his pastoral ministry. Among other developments, he employed artists to redecorate the church and restore icons. Following conflict with the authorities and interrogation by the KGB in 1964, he was suddenly moved away from Alabino, finding a role at a church in Tarasovka, north of Moscow.[95] A difficult period of conflict with the 'Stalinist' senior priest ensued, who continually denounced him, his books and pastoral ministry to the authorities.[96] This finally led to a transfer to the nearby Novaya Derenya parish in 1970, with whose priest he had a much better relationship.

From the mid 1960s, Men was beginning to attract attention from the so-called 'intelligentsia', becoming a 'spiritual father' to such figures as Nadezhda Mandelstam and Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn. This coincided with the writing of some of his most significant books, most of which discuss biblical texts at length. The first version of *Son of Man* was completed and circulated in *samizdat* (n.b. using a small-scale illegal printing press) from as early as 1958, with the volumes of *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life* following throughout the 1960s and 1970s. Through a contact in the French embassy,[97] Men was then able to transfer manuscripts abroad to be published *tamizdat* (n.b. published abroad and then smuggled back into the USSR and illegally distributed) under pseudonyms such as

94 Daniel, Wallace, *Russia's Uncommon Prophet,* 94-95.
95 Daniel, Wallace, *Russia's Uncommon Prophet,* 106-8.
96 Daniel, Wallace, *Russia's Uncommon Prophet,* 157.
97 Daniel, Wallace, *Russia's Uncommon Prophet,* 135. This was Anastasia Durova.

'Emmanuil Svetlov'. Thus began Men's long collaboration with the Brussels publishing house *La Vie avec Dieu.*[98] As Ann Komaromi points out,[99] within the USSR both *samizdat* and *tamizdat* were reliant on informal 'dissemination networks' for their circulation. Both were examples of "un-standardized, spontaneously disseminated, unfixed oral culture", perhaps rather similar in some respects to modern internet culture.

These volumes published in *samizdat* also corresponded with his more formal, though less well-known academic endeavours at the Moscow Theological Academy from 1964-1968, following which Men successfully defended his doctoral thesis on *The Elements of Monotheism in pre-Christian Religion and Philosophy* in 1969.[100] Of particular interest in this respect is a letter of Aleksandr Men to Professor Starokadomskii,[101] where he writes of his intention to edit chapters from the first two volumes of *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life* for his doctoral thesis, on the basis of suggestions of the latter. Intriguingly, Men writes to Starokadomskii, "You, it seems, are the only person in the Academy who is genuinely interested in scientific questions". It is unclear precisely what kind of 'scientific questions' Men had in mind, but it is clear from this that Men valued a certain critical quality uncommon in the Orthodox circles of his day.

Men's writing activities and pastoral engagement with the intelligentsia were bound to attract attention from the KGB and indeed, Men narrowly escaped 'unpleasantness' when his house

---

98 Жизнь с Богом.

99 Komaromi, Ann, 'Samizdat as Extra-Gutenberg Phenomenon'. *Poetics Today* 29, 4 (Winter 2008), 632,634-35,666. Cited in Daniel, Wallace, *Russia's Uncommon Prophet,* 134.

100 Вершилло Р., о. Мень, Александр Вольфович: https://antimodern.wordpress.com/2009/12/09/Men-2/ [Accessed 08/02/2018].

101 Predein notes that this was discovered by Vasilii Gelevan and included in his unpublished doctoral dissertation Жизненный путь и научное наследие профессора Духовной Академии М. А. Старокадомского, defended at Moscow Theological Academy on 03/06/2005. See Предеин Д.прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как выдающийся православный катехизатор.... 103-4.

was subjected to an eight-hour search for books of his friend Solzhenitsyn in 1965.[102] KGB informers attended his church, but Men was usually able to recognise them and use them to his own ends. He found unusual ways of organising meetings for prayer and discussion among his parishioners under the nose of the KGB. Michael Bordeaux describes one such arrangement, by which, as though by chance, members of his church community would assemble at Yaroslavsky station in Moscow to catch the 3.15 train home from work. The two-hour journey turned into an educational seminar.[103]

During the 1970s Men investigated the possibility of creating small groups as part of the Novaya Derevnya parish, which involved increasing care and tact. His 'spiritual child' Ilyushenko describes attending one of the first of these groups in 1977.

> Groups were created for the study of the Holy Scriptures, prayer, collective participation in the liturgy, helping one another and those outside the group (the sick, the elderly and the lonely) who needed it. We met once a week in the apartments of different members of the group. According to the conditions of the time, we acted conspiratorially, we did not discuss the theme of the meeting by telephone, and left meetings one-by-one or in pairs, with intervals.[104]

Considerable preparation was expected of those attending these small groups: each wrote an essay on the theme to be discussed, as though they were preparing for a university seminar. Ilyushenko gives an example of one such essay he wrote on the relationship between art and religion in around 1980.[105] Another of Men's biographers, Andrei Eremin, led one of these small groups[106] and accentuates the role of Bible study.[107] He writes that Men's most

[102] Daniel, Wallace, *Russia's Uncommon Prophet,* 113-5.
[103] Bourdeaux, Michael, *Gorbachev, Glasnost & The Gospel,* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1990), 88.
[104] Илюшенко В.И. Отец Александр Мень. Жизнь, смерть, бессмертие.... 369, 303.
[105] Илюшенко В.И. Отец Александр Мень. Жизнь, смерть, бессмертие.... 369-373.
[106] See Лёзов С. и Огнёв А. Лингвист Сергей Лёзов: «Если всё было фигней — мы стали ближе к истине» - Троицкого варианта — Наука. 29.03.2017. № 225. 8–9: http://trv-science.ru/2017/03/29/lyozov/ [Accessed 26/05/18].
[107] Еремин. А.А. Отец Александр Мень.... 398.

important instruction was always to prayerfully read and study the Holy Scriptures. Everything else in the Christian life depended on whether a person was willing to hear and act upon the resultant call heard in the heart.[108] Christians should therefore be expected to encourage love of the Scriptures in each other.[109] A trilogy entitled *Life in the Church*, not fully realised during Men's life, but written primarily during the 1970s when the small groups were active, included the work *How to Read the Bible* as its second volume.[110]

From 1964 to 1987, Aleksandr Men's pastoral ministry rested on a knife-edge. At any moment he could have been arrested due to his illegal printing activities, his collection of illegal material, including theological material related to the Bible and biblical interpretation, the small groups for Bible study, meetings which he hosted and encouraged where his 'besedy' took place, and his attachments to certain 'dissident' members of the intelligentsia. In the mid-1980s he went through a period of being called in for KGB interrogation almost every day after one of his former parishioners 'cracked'. He only avoided prison due to the careful manoeuvring of Metropolitan Yuvenalii of Krutitsky and Kolomna.[111] As part of this campaign against his ministry, the KGB pressurized him to cease sending work abroad to be published by *La Vie avec Dieu*. This did not bring to an end his literary endeavours, however. As well as the substantial textbook *Isagogics* (1982), his massive *Dictionary of Biblical Studies* dates primarily from the early 1980s; both works represent a still greater focus on Biblical Studies than before. The extent and quality of Men's *Dictionary* belie the difficulties of the context in which it was written and it provides a good example of his achievement in

[108] Еремин. А.А. Отец Александр Мень.... 102.

[109] Еремин. А.А. Отец Александр Мень.... 152. see also Илюшенко В.И. Отец Александр Мень. Жизнь, смерть, бессмертие.... 300. Beglov relates Men's recommendations for neophytes on Bible study: Беглов А. Пастырская деятельность отца Александра Меня: опыт систематизации – Альфа и Омега 2-3(64-65). М.б 2012. 348-363: 350-351. Men recommended between 5 and 7 chapters per day, with particular attention to the Gospels.

[110] The other volumes are *Sacrament, Word, Image* (Bibliography 1.1.4), and *Practical Guide to Prayer* (Bibliography 1.1.6).

[111] Daniel, Wallace, *Russia's Uncommon Prophet,* 237-242.

the area of academic theology, although it was not published during his lifetime. The *Dictionary* was rejected as the thesis for the 'doktor' qualification (the greater of two kinds of doctoral degree awarded by Russian universities) by the Leningrad Theological Academy in 1985 for unknown reasons.[112]

That his earlier books, circulated in *samizdat* and *tamizdat,* managed to gain as much success as they did during his lifetime is a testimony not only to Men's persistence, but to the originality of the content included and approach taken. This has continued after his death with the publication of works from the early 1980s. The posthumous publication of Men's *Dictionary* in 2002 provided a resource without obvious parallel in the Russian language. Other works from this period also published posthumously include *Isagogics, Light to the World* and *Saviour* for children. His surviving slide films, at the time an original approach to educating his parishioners, also date from between 1979 and 1983 and some have been published in written form (Bibliography 1.8.10).

1.1.4) Aleksandr Men Unleashed

Following the announcement of democratisation policies at the Twenty-seventh Party Congress at the beginning of 1986, change began to filter into church affairs. By late 1987 the climate of Men's ministry had changed significantly, and unprecedented opportunities appeared. Accompanying this, Men experienced a growing sense of urgency as he gave lecture after lecture at schools and colleges, presenting a 'Christian' stance on many different subjects. Some of his parishioners were concerned for his health, but as Men said, "it isn't

[112] Масленикова З.А. Жизнь отца Александра Меня, 506

easy to understand someone who for years has been tied up on a leash".[113] Adding to the urgency was a sense that the new 'freedom' presented very real dangers for the Russian Orthodox Church: those of conservatism, nationalism and the corresponding rejection of creative and scientific endeavours in the name of faith. As Eremin notes, the breadth of Men's worldview stood in opposition to these tendencies; he presented instead "a genuine, biblical, Christian view of the world".[114] The Bible "reveals to us the universalistic pathos of Christianity".[115] Of the 113 lectures (this is not the full number, which is estimated to be over 200[116]) listed in Bibliography 1 from this period, nearly half concern themselves directly with biblical exegesis and interpretation. Even the other lectures on themes such as church history, philosophy, literature, comparative religion, science, art and culture return frequently to the Bible, often using it as their fundamental reference point.

The final three years of Men's life involved not only lectures and presentations on such themes as the Bible, philosophy and church history, but a number of very significant events. Metropolitan Yuvenalii made him the chief priest of the church at Novaya Derevnya in 1989, assigning him the title *protopresbyter* and with it far greater freedom in his activities. In the year leading up to Men's assassination on 9th September 1990 he was able, among other things, to open a Sunday school for children in his church (the first in the Soviet Union), support the organisation of a new Russian Bible Society (the first such organisation since the closure of the original Bible society in 1826), and initiate the creation of an Orthodox Open University in Moscow, where the various critical stances taken in biblical studies would be on the curriculum. These three initiatives demonstrate the breadth of Men's engagement with the Bible and the levels on which it should be interpreted. He not only concerned himself with

[113] Daniel, Wallace, *Russia's Uncommon Prophet,* 246.
[114] Еремин. А.А. Отец Александр Мень.... 26.
[115] Еремин. А.А. Отец Александр Мень.... 20.
[116] Еремин. А.А. Отец Александр Мень.... 334. See also Андреева А. От составителя – Отец Александр Мень отвечает на вопросы слушателей. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1999.

academic study (Orthodox Open University), but with making the Bible accessible to ordinary believers (Bible Society) and presenting it in a simplified form to children (Sunday school).

These activities, together with his ever increasing public profile at the time of his death are reflected in Patriarch Aleksii II's tribute on 10th September 1990. "According to human thinking, it would seem that only now the time has come when the talent of Fr. Aleksandr as a preacher of the Word of God and creator of a genuinely communal parish life could unfold in all its fullness".[117]

1.1.5) Aleksandr Men's 'Legacy'

Men's activities, so it seemed, were rudely interrupted by his murder on 9th September 1990, possibly by the actions of a state that had been hostile to him throughout his ministry: although his murder remains unsolved, those closest to him have suggested that the most probable culprit is the KGB.[118] Some commentators within Russia have subsequently claimed that Men's ministry and work was a positive occurrence only within the confines of his own context; Kuraev even claimed he had died "on time", so as to not to compromise the progress of true Orthodoxy after 1991.[119] Men's activities, however, although interrupted, have continued in a number of ways. He left behind many educated and influential spiritual children, a Russian Orthodox Open University and a Bible Society operated by a number of his followers, which will now be discussed, not to mention a large volume of literature that has been published with increasing frequency year after year, discussed in 1.2. The recent

[117] Двадцать лет без отца Александра Меня. И с ним. Ред. Гениева Е.Ю., Рашковский Е.Б. М.: Центр книги Рудомино, 2010, 213.
[118] The words of Pavel Men, Aleksandr's brother, are recorded in Daniel, Wallace, *Russia's Uncommon Prophet,* 313.
[119] Кураев А. Александр Мень: Потерявшийся миссионер.

publications of his work initiated by the Moscow Patriarchate in 2015 are an especially significant example of his developing legacy as they represent official acceptance of at least some aspects of his theology by the Russian Orthodox Church, twenty-five years after his death.[120]

Men's legacy in the field of Bible translation, which could be construed as the direct result of certain initiatives he started in the final year of his life, has involved a number of his 'spiritual children'. During the 1970s and 80s, Men became increasingly interested in the possibility of a new translation of the Bible into modern Russian, finally becoming one of the founding members of the Russian Bible Society in 1990. Indeed, there is a direct connection between a number of the principal translators of the 2011 Bible in modern Russian, published by the Russian Bible Society and the 'legacy' of Aleksandr Men.[121]

1.1.5.1) A Brief History of Russian Bible Translation

Accounts of the controversial work of the first Russian Bible Society (1814-1826) and its closure may be found in books by Batalden and Rizhskii. Both also relate the various abortive attempts at translation that followed in the fifty years leading up to 1876, when the Synodal Bible, the first translation of the whole Bible into Russian, was finally completed. The *Afterword* of Batalden's volume gives what seems to be a groundbreaking account of biblical studies and Russian-language translation in the Twentieth Century. Yet it is dependent to a significant extent on information provided in Men's *Dictionary.*[122] In particular, Batalden

[120] https://www.rop.ru/novosti/article_post/aleksandr-men-isagogika-vethiy-zavet [Accessed 23/05/2019].

[121] Batalden, Stephen, *Russian Bible Wars,* 207, does not mention this explicitly, although he does refer to Men as a 'leading Russian biblical scholar'.

[122] For example, three major figures discussed by both are 'Eleonskii, Fedor Gerasimovich (1836-1906)' in Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том первый. 428-430; 'Glubokovskii, Nikolai Nikonorovich (1863-1937)' in Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том первый. 263-266; 'Evseev, Ivan Evseevich (1868-1921)' in Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том первый. 417-418.

claims that "the advances in Russian biblical studies culminated in the pre-revolutionary period in the work of Ivan Evseevich Evseev"[123] and cites Men on Evseev.[124]

Evseev energetically spoke out for the reconsideration of translation into Russian. He believed the closure of the Russian Bible Society to be a "deplorable historical mistake" and denounced the hounding to which the most selfless labourers in the field of biblical studies, including Makarii (Glukharev) and Protopresbyter Pavskii, were subjected in the 19th century. Evseev showed that only the efforts of Metropolitan Filaret (Drozdov) saved the matter of Russian-language translation. Taking into account differences in the manuscript traditions and translations, Evseev suggested producing a Russian translation exclusively following the Septuagint (preserving one of the most ancient traditions), or two translations simultaneously from the Hebrew and Greek languages. The most important demand put forward by Evseev for a future publication of the Russian Bible was a modernisation of language.

The sympathy and detail with which Men treats the first Russian Bible Society, Gerasim Pavskii and Makarii (Glukharev) in his respective articles on them in his *Dictionary*, suggests his agreement with Evseev. Men describes the work of the Bible Society as "genuinely Christian" and its closure both as "tragic" and primarily serving the "personal interests" of certain political figures.[125] Gerasim Pavskii is described as a "distinguished Russian academic, philologist, exegete and Bible translator" who, in Men's view, founded the Russian biblical-historical school. Men sympathises with him in the 1835 conflict with Metropolitan Filaret (Drozdov) in 1835 and views the repressions of the 1841 Pavskii Affair extremely negatively, citing Evseev.[126] Men also devotes a substantial and sympathetic article to Makarii (Glukharev's) efforts at Bible translation and missionary work.[127] Although, as mentioned above (1.1.2), Men was in some respects critical of Metropolitan Filaret (Drozdov), like Evseev, he recognised Filaret's significance in the matter of Bible translation, dedicating one of his most substantial *Dictionary* articles to him.[128]

---

123 Batalden, Stephen, *Russian Bible Wars,* 195.
124 Batalden, Stephen, *Russian Bible Wars,* 196, Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том первый. 418.
125 Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том третий Р-Я. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 54-56.
126 Pavskii's translations of the Old Testament were confiscated and destroyed together with his commentaries. Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том второй К-П. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 374-377.
127 Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том второй. 160-162.
128 Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том третий. 319-324,

Remarks in these articles show that Men saw the 1876 Synodal Bible as a great, although belated achievement. He clearly agreed with Evseev, however, that another Bible in modern Russian was necessary, which could be understood by ordinary believers. Unfortunately, but predictably, after 1917 little new translation work was done, excepting the New Testament translation of Bishop Kassian (Bezobrazov).

The Kassian translation's use of the Nestle Greek edition and its literary qualities led Men to use it rather than the Synodal Bible in later editions of *Son of Man.*[129] Men tactfully writes on this.

> In citing the New Testament, it was necessary for the author to relinquish the commonly-used synodal translation. Its positive qualities are undoubted, but, having been written more than one and a half centuries ago, it is dated both in scientific and literary senses. Therefore, in this book, a new translation has been used (with a few corrections), that was realised in Paris under the editorship of Bishop Kassian.[130]

> This translation, unfortunately, is far from perfect, but its advantage is that it has taken into account the achievements of modern textual criticism. When citing a few speeches of the Saviour in this translation, the text has been laid out according to the rules of sacred biblical poetry.[131]

In a number of his early 'religious histories', Men not only creatively used the most recent translations, but became one of a handful of Bible translators in the Soviet Union (with Averintsev and D′yakonov). In *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life* Men was reliant on his own translations in order to reproduce the biblical texts in comprehensible modern Russian for a broad audience, since there was no recent translation of the Old Testament for him to use. Men tells us in his introduction to *Magic Art and Monotheism, "*in citing the Holy Scriptures the Synodal Bible was used as a base, but in order to explicate the meaning, a few

[129] Batalden, Stephen, *Russian Bible Wars,* 201.
[130] Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2016. 12-13.
[131] Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий. 408.

passages (particularly poetic ones) were translated by the author anew following the critical edition of the Old Testament".[132] Similarly, we are told at the beginning of *Messengers*.

> The author was not afraid to frequently cite the works of the prophets. However, in the form in which they are found in our Synodal Bible, they are often unclear and difficult to understand. By reproducing the texts in his own translation according to his own abilities, following the critical edition and in close connection with the events of the prophets' lives, the author sought to make it easier for the reader to penetrate the meaning of their writings.[133]

He remarks that this approach is wholly in keeping with the traditions of Russian biblical studies, whose representatives often produced their own translations for use in 'scientific' work.[134] The unacknowledged difference here, of course, is that Men's *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life* is not a 'scientific' work, but an apologetic work intended for a popular readership, and Men's translations are specifically designed to ease the task of the reader rather than illuminate nuances in the biblical text for academic discussion.

In the early 1980s, Bible translation was an activity that had to be undertaken with great caution, but by the late 1980s, a number of translations of various biblical texts started to appear. On the surface, it seems Men did not actively engage in these projects. Rather, his commentaries for the Brussels Bible were commentaries to the Synodal Bible of 1876, and *Isagogics* used texts of the Synodal Bible, not Men's own translations. Both, however, included extensive philological notes and commentary, as well as commentaries of a more dogmatic nature. It is clear from his *Dictionary* article *Translation of the Bible into the Russian Language* that Men welcomed ongoing translation projects, such as those of Averintsev and D′yakonov.[135] The fact that he wrote introductions to translations of

---

[132] Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие. Религиозный путь человечества до эпохи великих Учителей. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, 15. The critical edition is *Biblia Hebraica,* ed. R. Kittell (Stuttgart, 1966).

[133] Мень А.прот. Вестники Царства Божия. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2010. 26.

[134] Мень А.прот. Вестники Царства Божия. 490. In addition to *Biblia Hebraica*, Men used Catholic translations 'Confraternity of Christian Doctrine' and 'Bible de Jerusalem' and Protestant translations 'Revised Standard Version' and 'The New English Bible' for reference in conducting his own translations.

[135] Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том второй. 422.

Ecclesiastes by D′yakonov (Bibliography 1.2.41) and Plisetskii (Bibliography 1.2.61) and to the translation of Mark's Gospel by Kuznetsova confirms this. Indeed, his involvement with both Averintsev and Kuznetsova, whose New Testament translation he actively supported in its early stages, and his key role in the foundation of the revived Russian Bible Society (RBS) in 1990,[136] mentioned above (1.1.4), were significant factors in the further development of Russian-language Bible translation.

The inaugural meeting of the RBS took place on 17th January 1990 and Men became responsible, in part, for its ongoing vision.[137] This continues to be demonstrated in a number of ways. First, the protagonists of the 2010-2011 disputes within the society argued over who faithfully represented the vision of "Fr. Aleksandr Men, Sergei Sergeevich Averintsev, Fr. Georgii Chistyakov, Nataliya Leonidovna Trauberg".[138] Second, the fact that RBS developed and published Evseev's ideas shows commonality between Men's views on Bible translation, and those of the rejuvenated Bible Society. Evseev's article *The Council and the Bible* from 1917, in which he outlined many of the views that Men agreed with, is published on the Society's web site, providing both a 'manifesto' and a connecting link with pre-1917 Russian biblical traditions.[139] Following these ideas, the Society has understood its purpose to be spreading the Word of God by providing "all who desire it with the Holy Scriptures in language understandable for them and at a price acceptable for them".[140]

Georgii Chistyakov mentions a further aspect of Men's vision for the Bible Society that is

[136] https://antimodern.wordpress.com/2010/09/23/rbo/ [Accessed 24/05/2018]. This article indicates which of Men's followers have been involved in running the Society.
[137] http://www.biblia.ru/rbo/history/page_18.htm [Accessed 22/05/2018].
[138] Заявление Правления Российского Библейского Общества в связи с созданием Института Библии. 18 Февраля 2011. http://www.sclj.ru/news/detail.php?SECTION_ID=240&ELEMENT_ID=3234&print=Y. [Accessed 23/05/18].
[139] Евсеев И.Е. Соборь и Библия. Http://www.biblia.ru/reading/articles/show/?12&start=0 [Accessed 22/05/18].
[140] Российское Библейское Общество. Цели и задачи. http://www.biblia.ru/about/aims/ [Accessed 22/05/18].

still one of its fundamental principles: ecumenism. He cites Men. “Only on the path of brotherly unity and respect for the various forms of ecclesial life can we hope, once more, to obtain the power, peace and blessing of God”.[141] For Men, a focus on the dissemination of Holy Scripture did not exclude and set up boundaries, but provided a foundation for this kind of ecumenical unity, which prefigures divine-human culture, an example of what Eremin calls “the universalistic pathos of Christianity”. The Bible Society’s interdenominational character has been controversial in more conservative Russian Orthodox circles,[142] but this ecumenism has continued to be part of the Society’s vision from its inception in 1990 to the present: in part it is preserved by publishing only commentaries of a philological, not dogmatic character.

1.1.5.2) Valentina Kuznetsova (1948-) and Sergei Averintsev (1937-2003)

The RBS initiated a translation of the New Testament into modern Russian in 1995 and completed it in 2001. The resulting volume, entitled *Radostnaya vest'* (Joyful News), was translated by Men’s follower and co-translator, Valentina Kuznetsova, although subject to editing and correction by others, and has, unsurprisingly, been controversial in a number of respects. Ilarion Alfeev, for example, gives the following critique.[143] “Acquaintance with this translation can turn the unprepared reader into a state of deep shock.... sometimes the feeling arises that you are not reading a sacred text, but present at a squabble in a communal flat”. He criticises Kuznetsova’s “conscious and consistent desacralisation of the text” and draws attention to her “overuse” of modern Russian conversational words, such as *glupyi* (‘stupid’) or *durak* (‘fool’). In 2 Corinthians 11:1-22, for example, Kuznetsova uses these words to

[141] Чистяков. Г. Фрагмент из книги 'Путь, что ведет нас к Богу'. М.: 2010. http://biblia.ru/reading/articles/show/?11&start=0 [Accessed 23/05/2018].

[142] For example, https://antimodern.wordpress.com/2010/09/23/rbo/ [Accessed 24/05/18]. Other articles here are similar.

[143] Иларион (Алфеев). Письма апостола Павла: http://biblia.ru/reading/articles/show/?6&start=0 [Accessed 24/05/2018].

translate the Greek *ἀφροσύνης* (v.1) and *ἄφρονα* (v.16), in place of the Synodal Bible's rather less abrasive *nerazumnyi* ('unwise'). Alfeev also criticises Kuznetsova's departures from the literal sense of the Greek words and recommends that believers continue using the 1876 Synodal Bible.

Kuznetsova's supporters replied that the New Testament was not written in literary, but conversational language, so translations should also be conversational.[144] The use of the term *durak* in Kuznetsova's translation was an intended reference to the Russian 'Holy Fool' (*yurodivyi*) tradition, rather than inappropriate use of modern slang.[145] Not only were some of Kuznetsova's translations more accurate than the 'literal' translations of the Synodal Bible, but avoided 'desacralisation' of the text precisely because they were "an attempt to put across the idiosyncratic style and manner of the original". Chistyakov repeated some of these points and then raised the stakes: by criticising Kuznetsova's attempt to translate the Bible into modern conversational Russian, Alfeev was "arguing not with V. Kuznetsova, but with Fr. Aleksandr [Men], indeed over one of the most important questions for Fr. Aleksandr".[146] A debate over Kuznetsova's translation thus becomes a debate over the 'legacy' of Aleksandr Men and its legitimate interpretation.

The extent of Men's influence on Kuznetsova is certainly difficult to overestimate. Her many commentaries on biblical texts, published by the Russian Orthodox Open University that Men founded, are dedicated to Men without exception.[147] In an interview, Kuznetsova recalls

[144] Насонова М. Голоса апостолов – НГ-религии 12(35) 23/06/1999.

[145] Левинская И. Размышляя над рецензией иеромонаха Илариона Алфеева на Письма Апостола Павла. Пер. и прим. В.Н. Кузнецовой. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1998: http://biblia.ru/reading/articles/show/?7&start=0 [Accessed 25/05/2018]. Her example is Protopope Avvakum, who engaged in *yurodstvo* at his seventeenth-century heresy trial on the basis of 1 Corinthians 4:10.

[146] Чистяков. Г. Фрагмент из книги 'Путь, что ведет нас к Богу'. Georgii Chistyakov (1953-2007) was another 'spiritual child' of Aleksandr Men, a co-founder of the Bible Society and lecturer on philology and the Bible. Much of his work shows a desire to communicate biblical themes in contemporary Russian for a popular readership, like Kuznetsova. His works are at http://www.tapirr.com/ekklesia/chistyakov/ [Accessed 01/06/2018].

[147] These include commentaries on Matthew (2002), Mark (2000), Luke (2004), John (2010), Romans (2013),

how she was one of his parishioners for twelve years, and how she initially worked on Bible translation as part of a group formed from his parishioners (including Sergei Lezov). She tells us, in her characteristically informal style, "[Men] had a great respect for knowledge. And first of all he wanted people to know and read the Scriptures, so that they understood it. He told us 'Guys, lets do a new translation. Come on, don't let them die idiots'". Only later Kuznetsova continued the work on her own and Men helped her significantly with her first translation of Mark's Gospel.[148] Men wrote a *Foreword* for the first publication of this translation of Mark's Gospel, in which he characterised Kuznetsova's translation in relation to other translations of the period.

> Today pluralism rules in the world practice of Bible translation. Accepting that any translation is to some extent an interpretation of the original, translators use the most varied procedures and linguistic paradigms, from classical literary traditions to everyday slang. This allows the reader to feel the different dimensions and nuances of the text. In our own [Russian] translations of the Bible we likewise find a number of approaches. Thus, in the traditional Synodal translation an affinity with the Church-Slavonic language is preserved, which is connected with purely historical reasons. S.S. Averintsev develops this tendency consciously and principally, striving to preserve the linguistic distance that separates us from the ancient text. With this purpose, he has become part of the world of Russian archaic and conservative poetry, coming from the legacy of Vyacheslav Ivanov, in particular. The translations of I.M. D'yakonov and I.Sh. Shifman are located in the same sphere, as are their translations of Ancient Eastern literature: archaisms are accentuated less, and the peculiarities of 'popular' language are preserved. In the translation of Mark's Gospel set before us, V.N. Kuznetsova follows a different path. She strives to attain the greatest convergence with living, contemporary Russian language. For this reason we see a rejection of archaisms, both in vocabulary and grammar, as well as historically conditioned semitisms, words that have lost their semantic content or words that have now changed their meaning. In some cases, if ancient facts do not have any conceptual significance, they have been put across in neutral Russian vocabulary. Passages that clearly follow a poetic structure have been translated in verse. The achievements of modern exegetics and philology have been taken into account (in particular with respect to correlation between Koine Greek and a Semitic substratum of the Gospel), and likewise the most authoritative modern translations.
>
> The translation has been undertaken from a 'scientific' edition, in which all the ancient manuscripts have been taken into account, and their textual peculiarities have been indicated.[149]

Men, like Kuznetsova, was very concerned that the Bible should be 'understood', as

Ephesians (2016) and Sirach (2006).

[148] Кузнецова В.Н. Мы работали с отцом Александром Менем в электричках: http://www.pravmir.ru/valentina-kuznetsova-myi-rabotali-s-aleksandrom-menem-v-elektrichkah/ [Accessed 26/05/2018].

[149] *The Greek New Testament*. Ed. by Aland, Black, Martini, Metzger, Wikgren. (Munster, 1975). Мень А.прот. Евангелие от Марка: Предисловие к новому переводу В.Н. Кузнецовой – Народы Азии и Африки 1989, 6, 112-4: 114. Bibliography 1.2.39.

demonstrated in this citation and his discussion of the history of Russian Bible translation. Therefore he was sympathetic to Kuznetsova's translation, since it effectively expressed certain conversational aspects of the text not previously clear. Does that mean, however, that Chistyakov was right to directly identify the translation principles of Men and Kuznetsova? This is more problematic. First, Men reflects on the fact that all translation is to some extent interpretation. Second, because of this, he defends a pluralistic approach to Bible translation: the translations of Kuznetsova and, for example, Averintsev, are not mutually incompatible, but complementary. Thus, where Alfeev and other representatives of the Russian Orthodox academic establishment recommend Averintsev's translations over those of Kuznetsova[150] and Kuznetsova, in turn, views Averintsev's translations as 'incomprehensible',[151] Men is prepared to accept both approaches as representations of different "dimensions and nuances of the text". Therefore, Chistyakov's comment is only partly true. If Alfeev had been arguing against the importance of 'understanding' the Bible, or indeed the possibility of translation into modern or conversational Russian, then of course he would have been arguing with Men. This is not the case.[152] His argument is specifically concerned with certain details of Kuznetsova's translation. Perhaps Men would have disagreed with Alfeev's views on these details, but it seems unlikely a defence of such details would have been of the principal importance Chistyakov claims. Given his 'pluralistic' approach, it is not likely that Men would have seen Kuznetsova's translation, at least on its own, as a 'replacement' for the Synodal Bible.

Men, of course, did not read Kuznetsova's later translations, conducted after Kuznetsova's

[150] Иларион (Алфеев). Язык Учителя и жаргон кабака: http://biblia.ru/reading/articleas/show/?8&start=0 [Accessed 26/05/2018]. Iannuarii (Ivliev) is another Russian Orthodox biblical scholar who has praised the translations of Averintsev: Ианнуарий (Ивлиев). Мудрость равновесия (Новозаветные переводы С.С. Аверинцева) http://spbda.ru/publications/arhimandrit-iannuariy-ivliev-mudrost-ravnovesiya-novozavetnye-perevody-s-s-averinceva/ [Accessed 26/05/2018].

[151] Кузнецова В.Н. Смешное в библии: http://polit.ru/articles/2015/08/09/kuznetsova/ [Accessed 26/05/2018].

[152] Иларион (Алфеев). Язык Учителя и жаргон кабака.

period of study with Paul Ellingworth at Aberdeen University in 1992-3 and under the influence of Eugene Nida's translation theories. Moreover, it seems he was not familiar with Nida's approach,[153] although Nida's methodology, when applied as intended, has broad commonality with the brief methodology set out by Men. Nida's 'functional equivalence' methodology focuses on 'common language' as a question of strategy rather than principle.

> If you were faced with a population of half a million which had no translation of the Bible, it was sensible to give priority to a translation which most of them could understand, rather than aiming at the well-educated five per cent, most of whom would in any case already have access to translations in other languages.[154]

Men, like Nida, wanted the Bible to be understood by as many people as possible, but neither did he deny the validity of literary interpretations.[155]

Not only Kuznetsova's translations, but also her carefully researched commentaries, have a popular and accessible rather than 'scientific' or 'academic' character. Kuznetsova's work on Paul, *The Apostle of Freedom*,[156] invites obvious comparison with Men's *The First Apostles*[157] and could be seen as a continuation of the spirit of Men's early 'religious histories'. In Kuznetsova's work, even if much attention is paid to philology and textual criticism, there is little reference to the Russian religious philosophers so dear to Men. Their terminology ('divine-humanity', 'all-unity' etc.), which is in fairly extensive usage even in Men's 'popular' books, is largely excluded from those of Kuznetsova. She specifically develops his view that the Bible needs to be disseminated in a way that it can be understood by ordinary people. Philosophies of interpretation and 'Russian school' thought are not at the forefront of

[153] There is no *Dictionary* entry on Nida, and articles on translation do not mention him.
[154] Ellingworth, Paul, 'Translation Techniques in Modern Bible Translation', ed. Noss, Philip *A History of Bible Translation,* 307-336: 331.
[155] This is demonstrated in the lectures published as *The Bible and Literature:* Мень А.прот., Библия и литература. There he draws on literary interpretations of biblical passages and encourages students to read them.
[156] Кузнецова В.Н. Апостолы свободы. М.: Общедоступный православный университет, 2012.
[157] Мень А.прот., Первые апостолы. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009.

her work.

The work of Sergei Averintsev provides an interesting contrast. He produced 'literary' translations, and, like Men, engaged seriously with the heritage of Russian religious philosophy in such works as the *Sofia-Logos Dictionary.*[158] Although Averintsev was not a 'follower' of Men in the same way as Kuznetsova and was probably not familiar with Men's later works (*Dictionary* and *Isagogics*),[159] he did comment on the pioneering nature of the earlier *Son of Man* and *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life*.[160] These works, as mentioned above, contained Men's own translations of biblical texts and frequent citations of various Russian religious philosophers including Solov′ev, Bulgakov, Berdyaev and the Trubetskoi brothers.

Averintsev, like Men, recognised the need for translations such as those of Kuznetsova and was supportive of her work. In his substantial article *Stylistic Problems of Biblical Translation*,[161] Averintsev discussed the various methodological challenges faced by Bible translators. While, as he asserted, one has to be careful not to unnecessarily break the familiar "biblical formulae that have entered into language", the realisation of a translation into 'modern Russian language' is an entirely valid task (he mentions Kuznetsova in this respect), as long as the translator is sufficiently critical about what is meant by 'modern Russian

---

158 Аверинцев С.С. Собранные сочинения. Том 2. София-Логос словарь. Киев: Дух и литера, 2006.

159 Averintsev died the year after Men's *Dictionary* was published.

160 Averintsev tells us in 'Missionary for the Tribe of the Intelligentsia': "Anyone who did not live in those years can only with great effort imagine or at least piece together in his/her mind the atmosphere of the frontier between the 50s and 60s. Even the 70s, whatever one might say, were a completely different matter: then *samizdat* had been created and at least in the capitals, if every self-respecting intellectual did not become a neophyte, then at least sympathised with those who did and tried to support conversations on religious-philosophical themes.... Fr. Aleksandr may be credited with an incomparable service: he did not give in to the hypnosis of powerful and destructive 'historical necessity'. Without heroic posturing, without forgetting to be careful, he made the impossible possible. He beat out the path. Now others will move along it." Аверинцев С.С. Миссионер для племени интеллигентов: http://krotov.info/library/13_m/myen/de_aver1991.html [Accessed 08/02/2018].

161 Аверинцев С.С. Стилистические проблемы библейского перевода - Собранные сочинения. Том 2. София-Логос словарь. 831-840: https://pravoslavnaya-obshina.ru/1996/no35/article/sergei-averincev-stilisticheskie-problemy-bibleiskog/ [Accessed 23/05/2019].

language'. Alfeev's application of this caveat to Kuznetsova's translation is rather more antagonistic, but essentially agrees that in rejecting any form of historical distancing in translation, translators easily find themselves unintentionally imposing modern ideologies on the text.[162]

By emphasising the role of 'historical distancing', Averintsev leaves space for the role of the Church in providing 'biblical formulae' and cautions that its interpretive role cannot be simply left out. A translator cannot approach the biblical text 'directly', no matter how much he/she may desire to do this. If translators do not stand in any particular interpretive and ecclesial tradition, then they uncritically impose their own presumptions. The reader of the resulting translation will be unaware of these methodological concerns and may absolutise a text with many conditional elements.

Men's ecclesial principle for biblical interpretation (2.2.3), developed from 'Russian school' thought, tacitly acknowledges the value of this line of thought. Nonetheless, a methodological quagmire results if ecclesiality is not accompanied by plurality. Alfeev does not appear to recognise that 'literary' translations are equally liable to impose certain unquestioned ideologies on a text: the concept of historical distancing and the value of 'formulae' are cases in point. Men's pluralistic approach, which shows the universalising tendencies of his approach to biblical interpretation, is both pragmatic and ecclesial; it acknowledges that different ideologies bring to light different aspects of the text, and therefore bring their own relative validity. Thus, while supportive of Averintsev's presidency of the RBS in 1990,[163] he saw the value of Kuznetsova's 'populism'.

[162] Аверинцев С.С. Стилистические проблемы библейского перевода. 838-839.
[163] 'Averintsev Sergei Sergeevich' in Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том первый. 31.

Mikhail Seleznev (1960-), who took charge of the Russian Bible Society's Old Testament translation (published 2011), appears to provide a synthesis of approaches taken by Kuznetsova and Averintsev that runs closer to the 'pluralism' of Men. Seleznev, unlike Averintsev, is familiar with Men's *Dictionary:* he was the consultant editor for its first publication in 2002.[164] Although Seleznev rarely refers to Men in his published work, his views on the use of biblical criticism, dynamism in the Bible,[165] polyphonic interpretation[166] and his positive relation to the work of the 'Russian school' figure Anton Kartashev[167] find parallels in Men's work.

In 2011, Seleznev was one of the principle protagonists in what appears to have been an internecine dispute, the substance of which has nowhere been published: he left the Russian Bible Society, together with its then president, Aleksandr Borisov (follower of Aleksandr Men and schoolfriend of Men's brother Pavel) to form the Institute of the Bible,[168] apparently because he 'categorically disagreed' with Kuznetsova's translation principles and did not wish his Old Testament translation to be combined with her New Testament. It is hard to believe Men would have approved of this stance, but such events nonetheless indicate that Men's legacy is alive and well, and continues to be the source of both inspiration and substantial debate within Russian biblical studies.

---

[164] Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том первый. 4

[165] Seleznev, unusually, cites Men on this: Михаил Селезнев: "Христианская библеистика: история и апологетика", given at the conference "The Spiritual Legacy of Fr. Aleksandr Men" (14/02/2015): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1j92DpuUKTc [Accessed 29/05/2018].

[166] Селезнев М.Г. О пользе библейской критики для христианского богословия: http://www.pravmir.ru/o-polze-biblejskoj-kritiki-dlya-xristianskogo-bogosloviya/ [Accessed 29/05/2018].

[167] Селезнев М.Г. Исследуйте Писания. О переломном моменте в истории русской библеистики. Журнал Московской Патриархии № 2, 2014: http://www.pravmir.ru/issledujte-pisaniya-o-perelomnom-momente-v-istorii-russkoj-bibleistiki/ [Accessed 29/05/2018].

[168] Http://www.blagovest-info.ru/index.php?ss=2&s=3&id=39369 [Accessed 31/03/18].

1.1.5.3) Aleksandr Men's 'Liberal Protestant' Critic Sergei Lezov (1954-)

Sergei Lezov was originally one of Men's parishioners. He was a participant in the group of translators brought together by Men in the early eighties, alongside Valentina Kuznetsova: between 1982 and 1984, he even studied Greek with Kuznetsova.[169] He was introduced to the writings of various 'Liberal Protestant' biblical critics, including Rudolf Bultmann, by the group. Reading this material, he claimed later, led him to become a critic of the Russian Orthodox Church, and that included the ministry, works and legacy of Aleksandr Men, whom he criticised for creating the "playful counter-world" and "illusory alternative reality" of a liberal sub-culture within Orthodoxy.[170]

Even after his break with Men, he continued to work with Kuznetsova, and together with Sergei Tishchenko they produced and published in 1992 a new translation of the canonical Gospels with commentaries.[171] This is a work of which Men undoubtedly would have approved and demonstrates that at least one of Lezov's goals remained close to that of his original mentor: to tell "the Russian people the truth about the Gospel"[172] by producing a modern Russian-language Bible translation. Throughout this period, he continued studying 'Liberal Protestant' theologians, and found particular inspiration in Bultmann's form criticism and the possibility he believed he demonstrated of adopting a 'purely scientific' approach to Bible study. Lezov went on to take charge of the first Russian-language translation of Bultmann's works.[173]

[169] Лёзов С. и Огнёв А. Лингвист Сергей Лёзов: «Если всё было фигней — мы стали ближе к истине».
[170] Лезов С.В. Очерки современного православного либерализма, 198.
[171] Канонические Евангелия. М.: Восточная литература, 1992.
[172] Лёзов С. и Огнёв А. Лингвист Сергей Лёзов.
[173] Бультман Р. Избранное: Вера и понимание. М.: Российская политическая энциклопедия, 2004.

The contrast between Men and Lezov here is related to an ecclesial choice made. Men's sizeable *Dictionary* article on the German theologian presents his critique:[174] to summarise very briefly, Bultmann's use of form criticism took inadequate account of the early tradition of the church, and his demythologisation was largely inapplicable to the Gospel genre, although Men wished to apply it to the Old Testament. Unusually for a Russian Orthodox priest in the Soviet Union, Men knew the work of Bultmann reasonably well, but still preferred to take 'Russian school' thought as his point of departure. Lezov, in contrast, considers Solov′ev, Berdyaev, and Tareev to be thinkers who raised questions only fully answered either in Liberal Protestantism or the Western post-Kantian philosophical tradition, despite their attempts to reassess the role of tradition in biblical interpretation.[175] They are at best only secondary sources for questions of theological interpretation.

Lezov, it seems, stands in particular opposition to the kind of approach adopted by Averintsev. If Averintsev made space for the Church in biblical interpretation by insisting on the value of 'historical distancing' when speaking of translations into modern Russian, then Lezov sought to wholeheartedly renounce the ecclesial principle in favour of 'science'. That Men retains the ecclesial principle even while adopting certain 'liberal' stances means he is compromised by his adherence to the unscientific ecclesial notions of the Russian Orthodox Church, just like his 'Russian school' forebears. Men's earlier 'religious histories' (*Son of Man* and *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life*) can therefore only have value as popularizing and apologetic works rather than as truly 'scientific' studies. In his failure to acknowledge these limitations, Men created the "illusion of scientific creativity, a critical approach to tradition..., and the illusion of Orthodox biblical studies".[176] Yet Men's critique of

[174] Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том первый. 164-170.
[175] Лезов С.В. Христианин в христианстве – Попытки понимания: избранные работы. СПб.: Университетская книга, 1998, 170-171.
[176] Лезов С.В. Очерки современного православного либерализма, 206. Ilyushenko mocks this: Илюшенко В.И. Отец Александр Мень. Жизнь, смерть, бессмертие.... 170-171.

Bultmann's methodology was genuine, and as we discuss in Chapters Two and Three, Men's own interpretive methodology was, following 'Russian school' thinkers, the product of much critical reflection. That Bultmann's 'scientific' interpretations require their own set of assumptions concerning the role of tradition in interpretation, Lezov does not consider.

Another of Lezov's critiques of Men concerns the relationship between Judaism and Christianity, and once again primarily demonstrates Lezov's rejection of Russian Orthodoxy.[177] Both Men's parents were of Jewish background, although his mother had him baptised Orthodox in the Catacomb Church (1.1.1). This Jewish background has been the source of controversy within certain more conservative-nationalistic Orthodox circles. The content of the extremely antagonistic and antisemitic letter from Metropolitan Antonii Melnikov that accused Men of various actions against the spirit of Orthodoxy is, needless to say, wholly unjustified. The letter was probably a fabrication by the KGB anyway, as Predein argues.[178] Men's response (Bibliography 1.7.17) is consistent with the two other 'works' in which he speaks of the relationship between Judaism and Christianity, the interview *Jews and Christianity*, (Bibliography 1.3.2), and the *beseda, Is Judaeo-Christianity possible?* (Bibliography 1.5.55). Men distinguishes between Jewish nationality and the Christian faith, claiming that the culture and traditions of Judaism shape the expression of Christian faith for a person from this background. Men's christocentric theology makes these traditions strictly secondary, following Galatians 3:28. 'Judaeo-Christianity' as a "kind of synthesis of Old Testament practices and New Testament faith" is therefore unnecessary.[179] Lezov, who maintains that Orthodoxy is inherently antisemitic, is unimpressed, and unprepared to excuse

[177] For example, in 'On the fact that Christianity did not develop from Judaism' (29/09/1997), 'The National Idea and Christianity' (1990), and 'The New Testament and Judaeophobia' (1991): see Лезов С.В. О непроисхождении христианства из юдаизма; Национальная идея и христианство; Новый завет и юдофобия – Попытки понимания: избранные работы. СПб.: Университетская книга, 1998.

[178] Предеин Д.прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как выдающийся православный катехизатор.... 123.

[179] Мень А. Что такое юдеохристианство? - Континент 95, 1998: http://www.golubinski.ru/ecclesia/iudeo.htm [Accessed 28/05/2018].

Men's theological views on the grounds that he is defending himself from antisemitic abuse.

In his article *Sketches of Modern Orthodox Liberalism,* Lezov criticises these views on the basis that 'Christianity' and the 'Christian faith' as constructed by the Orthodox Church are themselves products of 'ethno-religious categories'.[180] His arguments are based on various discussions within post-war 'Liberal Protestant' circles that attempt to assess theologically the aftermath of the Holocaust. For the Orthodox, even for a 'Righteous Among the Nations' figure like Mother Maria Skobtsova, the "fate of the world is connected with the conversion of the Jews to Christ".[181] This, Lezov claims, prohibits the Jews from simply being seen as 'people'. Men's christocentricity, as demonstrated in the three pieces noted above on 'the Jewish Question' and elsewhere in his extensive written corpus, is entirely consistent with the Orthodoxy of Mother Maria and others. The fact that Men held these views as an ethnic Jew, made him the "ideal Jew-Christian of Russian messianism," according to Lezov.[182] For Lezov, Men's view that one could be at the same time both a Jew ethnically and a Christian with respect to faith is essentially 'Judaeo-Christianity' and another aspect of the liberal 'alternative reality' that Men 'unsuccessfully' tried to create within Orthodoxy.

Whatever one may think of these criticisms, they clearly illuminate two very significant aspects of Men's biblical thought. By his 'dialectical rejection' of Men's approach to biblical interpretation as insufficiently critical and potentially antisemitic, Lezov highlights the christocentric nature and 'Russian school' foundations of Men's biblical interpretation. Without a sympathetic relation to these qualities it will be difficult to accept or understand Men's exegetical framework and biblical theology. The qualitative distinction between revelation in Christ and Old Testament revelation, Solov′ev's 'divine-humanity' and the

[180] Лезов С.В. Очерки современного православного либерализма, 199-200.
[181] Лезов С.В. Очерки современного православного либерализма, 201.
[182] Лезов С.В. Очерки современного православного либерализма, 202.

centrality of covenantal themes are all dependent on a christocentric worldview. If christocentricity is negated, Men's interpretive edifice will appear to be an 'illusory' 'alternative reality'.

Lezov's words of refrain 'alternative reality' and 'illusory' illustrate a tacit recognition that Men's 'life' and 'works' went further than mere dissidence. Men's attempts at creating an 'alternative reality' moved things "onto an entirely different plane":[183] this was something negative, because it ineffectively masked the grim reality of life in the Soviet Union rather than challenging it. Men, however, did not believe that his theological and ecclesial approach to the Christian faith was the illusory counterpart to Soviet life: an encounter with Christ through Scripture had the potential to completely transform Soviet culture, which at its worst was an antagonistic reaction to the Christian faith and at best only a conditional reality. Lezov's 'alternative reality' is the dialectical counterpart to Men's intention, which is to create truly divine-human culture, both among his parishioners and in broader Soviet society. The Bible was significant as the clearest and most extensive witness to this true reality. It was to be understood not only on 'scientific' terms, but as 'life'. If the life of Christ is not a concrete divine-human reality, then there is no particular urgency about understanding the Bible. As shown in Chapter Three, Sergei Trubetskoi's theological account of the Person of Christ as 'concrete reality' was a key source for Men's account of the divine-human reality of the Person of Christ.

1.1.6) Summary

Men's biography, as related in 1.1.1-4, demonstrates both his theological interests and the central importance of Bible study to Men's own faith, his ministry and theology. Throughout

[183] Лезов С.В. Очерки современного православного либерализма, 197.

his life, he engaged with the Bible on a number of levels, both asking questions of it himself and seeking to make it more comprehensible for his parishioners, regardless of their level of education or age. The words of the Bible were to be appropriated prayerfully and acted upon, while critical methods were to be applied to the Bible in order to explicate its meaning. Men sought to give his exegesis both greater depth and greater clarity. The basic purpose of all of this was to lead as many people as possible to encounter the Person of Jesus Christ for themselves, so that the transformational power of that encounter could transform both them and their relations with others. Establishing Christian community was an essential way of expressing this christocentric reality, and Men's experiences in the Catacomb Church, the intellectual 'micro-culture' of his school years and the Russian Baptist Church in Irkutsk acted as an obvious model for this.

The biographical sketch also shows that Men's literary activities were of significant scale and seriousness and interlaced with his pastoral concerns. His written works were the product of many years spent studying Russian and Western theological sources. He also gained a doctorate from the Moscow Theological Academy in pre-Christian Monotheism. This theme, although important for Men, may be explained in the light of biblical studies: ancient religions were conditional spiritual cultures awaiting transformation through encounter with the Person of Jesus Christ, revealed through the witness of the Bible. In this respect they had much in common with the materialist ideology of the Soviet Union. Thus Biblical interpretation had significance beyond the practicalities of Men's formal ministry; it was the central unifying concern of his thinking both before and after his ordination in the Orthodox Church and the key to the transformation of the culture in which he found himself.

By considering Men's legacy in the field of Bible translation, we locate him clearly within

the Russian interpretive tradition of Pavskii and Evseev, who saw the necessity of aiding ordinary Russians to understand the Holy Scriptures. The projects of the recreated Russian Bible Society have provided a clear ongoing example of Men's theological legacy and several of its figures have reflected individual aspects of Men's vision for biblical studies in Russia. Kuznetsova has reflected the more 'popular' aspects of Men's approach in her work, while largely setting the Russian philosophical tradition on one side. Others, such as Averintsev, and more recently, Seleznev, have taken more interest in connecting their approach with 'Russian school' philosophies. That all these figures may find inspiration in Men indicates his pluralistic approach to the matter, grounded in his divine-human understanding of the nature of Scripture.

Lezov has adopted Men's desire for the Bible to be understood, together with an interest in critical thinking, but has refused to see Russian Orthodox theology or tradition as helpful. Lezov's accusations that Men attempted to create an 'alternative reality' reveal a significant aspect of Men's practical biblical interpretation. Men saw in the Bible the possibility of transforming encounter with Jesus Christ. When Soviet people encountered Christ in this way, they were able to realise what Eremin calls the "universalistic pathos of Christianity" by creating divine-human culture from the biblical theology that Men derived from his interpretive methods. The difference between Lezov and Men hinged on their interpretations of the Person of Christ and the possibility of encounter with Him: for Men the culture among his parishioners was at best true Christ-centred reality; for Lezov it was an illusory, almost cultic, reality.

1.2) Understanding the Nature of Aleksandr Men's 'Works'

Few assessments of Aleksandr Men have taken his 'works' as their point of departure, despite the fact that Men himself saw his writing as a major, perhaps the most significant part of his pastoral ministry. "To whom it has been given to write, that person has long ago received blessing for it and must do it. Writing is a part of pastoral ministry, its continuation. Words often disappear in part, but what has been written remains."[184] To date, Dmitrii Predein's 2015 Russian-language monograph is the most significant attempt to give both a complete list and brief analysis of Men's 'works'. It divides them into the following categories: i) books written and prepared for publication by Men himself; ii) books comprising articles and records of sermons, lectures, presentations and *besedy* (conversations or discourses); iii) brochures; iv) correspondence between Fr. Aleksandr Men and different individuals; v) translation.[185] The structure of his list is not wholly dissimilar to that given in *About Myself,*[186] although Predein attempts to determine whether a text was fundamentally structured by Men himself, or collated by editors posthumously (the division between categories (i) and (ii)). Significant methodological problems arise, however, despite this improvement. First, Predein limits his list to materials published in book form; he ignores journal articles not republished in collections, lectures and *besedy* only available online, and correspondence only available embedded in the works of others. Unfortunately, the material that has been ignored is substantial in both size and substance, as demonstrated by a careful perusal of some of the more detailed bibliographies.[187] Second, by listing the various collections published by Men's

[184] Мень А.прот. Два письма Владимиру Волгину: http://www.krotov.info/library/13_m/myen/2_1984volg.html. [Accessed 20/06/2018].
[185] Предеин Д.прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как выдающийся православный катехизатор.... 44-48.
[186] Bibliography 1.1.16. Мень А.прот. О себе... 298-300.
[187] These include: 1) the Bibliography compiled by Alexander Men Foundation in Moscow http://www.alexandrmen.ru/bibliografia.html [Accessed 23/05/2019] and 2) the Bibliography compiled by Yakov Krotov http://www.krotov.info/library/13_m/myen/_bibl_menn.htm [Accessed 25/03/2018].

followers rather than the individual lectures and *besedy* contained within them, Predein attributes primary significance not to a work's original literary context, but to the context created by the collection. The same materials are in fact repeated a number of times in different, imported, literary contexts. The collection *Magic, Occultism, Christianity*,[188] for example, consists entirely of excerpts from Men's other published 'works', in a literary context essentially created by his relatives and spiritual children. This is a pragmatic and appealing way of presenting Men's work to readers, but the methodological limitations of using such volumes for reliably establishing Men's most significant theological concerns should be recognised. Third, where Predein attempts to summarise the contents of Men's works, he assesses each work against the criteria of what he considers acceptable Orthodox theology. The advantages and disadvantages of this approach in Men's case, as well as his relation to the broader tradition of biblical interpretation in Russian Orthodoxy, will be discussed in Chapter Two. The present discussion (1.2), however, first of all attempts to take Men's works on their own terms, creating a methodology for engagement by delineating the genres in which he operated, periodising his works and establishing which of these are the most significant.

1.2.1) Categorising Aleksandr Men's 'Works' according to Genre (Bibliography 1 gives a categorisation following the methodology presented).

Three substantial difficulties hinder the definition of a 'work' of Aleksandr Men and therefore any categorisation of such 'works'. First, the content of Men's books and articles exhibit considerable fluidity; in many cases they were revised on multiple occasions, materials from articles incorporated into books and vice versa. The term 'complete' has

[188] Мень А.прот. Магия, оккультизм, христианство. Из книг, лекций и бесед. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1996.

dubious significance for assessing this body of material, since the titles of books often resembled placeholders for developing bodies of material, rather than any discrete and 'completed' printed product. In some cases Men even changed the title of a particular 'work', or gave different 'works' the same title.[189] Bibliography 1 has sought to bring clarity by assigning numbers to these 'bodies' of materials, listing titles, the dates at which key changes were made and the related works from which materials were incorporated. Second, in a number of cases, establishing Men's authorship or its extent is highly problematic, due to the contextual specificities of writing under a persecuting regime. Many of Men's works, including even his personal correspondence, were written either under pseudonyms or anonymously; for the majority of these Men's authorship is relatively well-documented and straightforward to determine, but for others it is a very complex matter that would involve research beyond the scope of the present study. The most significant example of this is the case of the commentary for the *Brussels Bible* (Bibliography 1.1.9). These materials were published anonymously and the debate concerning their authorship is detailed, although not resolved, below (1.2.3). Bibliography 1 has attempted to draw attention to questions of anonymous and pseudonymous authorship. Third, since, as mentioned above, much material has been published since Men's death in various collections, there should be a methodology for approaching these collections. Bibliography 1, as a list of 'works', has resolved this problem by excluding them (except in the general list Bibliography 1.9). Articles, interviews, lectures, and *besedy* are listed separately, thus removing unnecessary repetition and highlighting where different works have similar titles.[190] Individual 'works' are returned from imported contexts.

[189] Мень А.прот. О себе... 230. Men speaks of burning manuscripts and completely rewriting works already published, including *Son of Man.*

[190] In different collections, the same work may be listed under different titles. For example, the book *Sacrament, Word and Image* (Таинство, слово и образ) is also known as *Heaven on Earth* (Небо на земле). Substantially different works may also be listed under the same title. For example, three different works are entitled *Light to the World* (Свет миру) and there are three series of lectures on the *Symbol of Faith* (Символ веры).

Once these three matters have been clarified, a 'work' of Aleksandr Men may be defined as a body of interrelated material developed by Men himself for some form of unified presentation or publication, although that publication may have been pseudonymous or anonymous.

The Alexander Men Foundation[191] organises works by genre on its web site, although, as with Predein's list, there is considerable repetition due to the inclusion of collections. In Bibliography 1, Men's works have been categorised according to eight different kinds of material in a broadly similar way, although with some differences.[192] *Bibliography 1.1: Books* includes anything that was intended for publication in this form by Men himself, even in the most general sense. Thus, alongside well-known 'completed' works, such as *Son of Man,* incomplete works such as *The First Apostles* have been included as well as Men's memoirs, which were recorded in audio format with the intention of using them as material for a book in the future. This section has been further subdivided by genre: Men's 'religious histories', which were intended in part as apologetics for a popular readership; his trilogy *Life in the Church*, which was intended as a compilation of materials for church members; his works on biblical studies with more explicitly pedagogical and 'academic' content; his excursions into literature and finally the autobiographical materials he gathered.

Bibliography 1.2: Articles includes anything intended by Men himself for publication in journals or newspapers, with the exception of interviews, which are listed separately. It has been most helpful to delineate these articles into four subdivisions: those published in

[191] http://www.alexandrmen.ru/ [Accessed 06/05/2018]. Many works have now (23/05/2019) been removed from this site.

[192] Compilations of answers to questions, sermons and citations have been excluded from this list (although they have been included in the *Bibliography*), due to the impracticality of listing them as separate items and their relative insignificance for the current study. Articles have been listed as a separate category.

Orthodox journals within the USSR, those published abroad, those published in Soviet journals in the period 1988-1990 and those published posthumously. Although these subdivisions are primarily related to periodisation rather than genre, each of these categories also has its own genre characteristics: the first two categories are primarily concerned with theological matters, whereas the third and fourth subdivisions are far more eclectic, engaging in extensive social and political commentary. The most substantial theological articles date from the 1980s.

Given their considered nature, Men's books and articles should take methodological precedence over his interviews, lectures, *besedy* and sermons. *Bibliography 1.3: Interviews* contains materials published in journals and newspapers as well as recorded dialogues between Men and his parishioners. Most of these date from the final three years of his life and subjects discussed are varied in content. *Bibliography 1.4: Lectures* lists the public lectures given on a variety of themes in the years 1988-1990. *Bibliography 1.5: Besedy*[193] lists presentations given in a private setting, often among his parishioners. They are often undated, but it seems almost all of them are from the 70s and 80s. Their private, informal setting should be noted, as Men felt a greater degree of freedom to express his own thinking. *Bibliography 1.6: Sermons* contains materials presented in a liturgical context in the 70s and 80s, usually at Men's church in Novaya Derevnya. From a theological perspective, these sermons are generally quite insubstantial, although they give insight to the nature of Men's pastoral ministry and his relationship to certain aspects of Orthodox teaching. Men's interviews, lectures, *besedy*, and sermons are generally materials presented by Men spontaneously without prior preparation.[194] The lectures, *besedy*, and sermons, with few

[193] The Russian term *besedy* may be translated 'conversations' or 'discourses', but neither of these English terms accurately characterise the genre. These 'works' had much in common with Men's lectures: they consist almost entirely of monologue, but with their informal context in private homes allowing for interjections from listeners.

[194] Vladimir Levi writes: "Fr. Aleksandr once admitted to me that he never prepared for lectures...." See Илюшенко В.И. Отец Александр Мень. Жизнь, смерть, бессмертие.... 69.

exceptions, were reconstructed by Men's spiritual children from audio tapes, rather than written notes. Therefore, they can only be allocated subsidiary methodological significance: they shed light on the aspects of Men's thought presented in books and articles. The *besedy* are of relatively greater interest, because, due to their private nature, Men occasionally expressed in them personal theological views with a degree of simplicity and clarity rarely found elsewhere in his 'works'. The lectures are of interest primarily because they have greater thematic breadth.

Bibliography 1.7: Correspondence lists Men's various letters, which are most often pastoral in nature, although occasionally polemical, such as letters to Volgin and Anisimov. A relatively small number of letters express a high level of personal theological engagement: these letters, for example, to Reitlinger and Maslenikova, are of some significance for the present study, although there is relatively little material in them directly concerned with biblical studies. *Bibliography 1.8: Other* contains materials not included elsewhere, such as prayers and other pastoral instructions, together with Men's slide films.

In categorising Men's works by genre, we have established a methodological hierarchy for locating the most significant sources of Men's theological thought. Generally, these are his books and articles and materials from *besedy*, lectures and correspondence supplement these where appropriate.

1.2.2) Periodisation of Aleksandr Men's 'Works'

The periodisation of Men's 'works' sheds further light on this methodological hierarchy, as it provides a narrative of Men's creative development. A careful analysis of Men's 'works'

(Bibliography 1) suggests four creative periods, each with its own set of characteristics.

The first of these runs from the beginning of his diaconate in 1958 to around 1968, when *Son of Man* was first published by *La Vie avec Dieu* in Brussels. Significant works of the period are the various articles written for the *Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate* (Bibliography 1.2.1-22), and early *samizdat* versions of *Son of Man* (Bibliography 1.1.1), *Wellsprings* (Bibliography 1.1.2.1), *Magic Art and Monotheism* (Bibliography 1.1.2.2), *At the Gates of Silence* (Bibliography 1.1.2.3), and *Dionysus, Logos, Fate* (Bibliography 1.1.2.4). These early versions of relatively well-known books are no longer extant, and, it may be surmised, have been 'superseded' by the substantially revised editions produced by Men himself in later years. The early articles have, however, been published in the collection *Towards Christ*[195] and give us some idea of the characteristics of his early work, especially the earliest versions of *Son of Man,* which included them as chapters.

Most of these articles retell the stories of the Gospels, contextualising them in the life of first-century Palestine (this is the material used in *Son of Man),* but a small number of articles consider other themes, such as the poetry of Gregory of Nazianzus (Bibliography 1.2.2), Racism (Bibliography 1.2.17), the Biblical Archaeology of Ernest Wright (Bibliography 1.2.20) and Liberius of Rome (Bibliography 1.2.22). That Men was aware of the Biblical Archaeology movement in this early period is significant, and its importance is reflected in the substantial quantity of citations from works by Ernest Wright, John Bright and William Albright in *Magic Art and Monotheism*. Despite controversy surrounding the postulates of 'Biblical Archaeology',[196] the use of its results shows that Kuraev's criticism ("[Men] based

[195] Мень А.прот. Навстречу Христу....

[196] Criticism is offered in Thompson, Thomas, *The Historicity of the Patriarchal Narratives: The Quest for the Historical Abraham* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1974) and van Seters, John, *Abraham in History and Tradition* (London: YUP, 1975). Debate has grown more positive with Seymour Gitin referring to an attempt to return archaeology from an anthropological to a historical setting: Gitin, Seymour, 'The House that Albright Built', *Near Easterm Archaeology,* 01/03/2002, *65(1),* 5-10.

his ideas on publications accessible to him, that is to say mostly pre-revolutionary literature....”[197]) is untenable even at this early stage in Men’s creative development. That said, one of the principal characteristics of these early articles is a lack of referencing and citation; it is difficult to claim that these theological articles written during the enactment of Khrushchev’s repressive religious policies were presented according to any normal academic conventions.

As D. G. Dobykin and N. A. Tarnakin note, the principal advantage of Men’s articles is their “use of striking and expressive imagery” that leads to a ‘literary’ interpretation of the biblical texts. The 1960 article *Tabor and Golgotha* (Bibliography 1.2.8) is a good example: although no texts are cited other than the Bible, ‘literary’ qualities are in plentiful evidence.[198] Men’s articles could not be described as ‘scientific’, despite some coming very close, especially those written between 1961 and 1963. *Martyrdom of John the Baptist* (Bibliography 1.2.11),[199] for example, contained more substantial elements of critical exegesis, provoking in turn a concerned response from Patriarch Aleksii I with its claim that John the Baptist had doubted the Messianic calling of Christ (Mt. 11:3, Lk. 7:19). Men’s subsequent response to the Patriarch (Bibliography 1.7.1) showed an emphasis on the human qualities of John the Baptist.

The lack of citation in these articles and resulting ‘unscientific’ character must be attributed, at least to some extent, to the repressive censure applied to this journal. Writer Anatoli Levitin remarks that all articles were subject to approval by the Council for Religious Affairs and the Chief Administration for Literature and Publishing. Furthermore, he claimed,

[197] Кураев А. Александр Мень: Потерявшийся миссионер.

[198] Добыкин Д.Г., Тарнакин Н.А. Текстология и библейская история в трудах православных библеистов в СССР. Период с 1953 по 1964гг. - Христианское чтение 5, 2017, 61-74: 67. Добыкин Д.Г., Тарнакин Н.А. Актуальные вопросы в трудах православных библеистов в СССР. Период с 1953 по 1964гг. - Христианское чтение 6, 2017, 108-122: 114.

[199] Добыкин Д.Г., Тарнакин Н.А. Текстология и библейская история... 68.

references to foreign sources were not allowed, and, even more surprisingly, neither were references to Soviet 'scientific' literature, as the government wished the church to appear out of touch with Soviet views.[200] Linguistic requirements were also applied by the Council of Religious Affairs to meet these ends: archaic terms were favoured over modern replacements. Men, during his time writing for the journal appears to have subverted some of these requirements with his vivid 'literary' approach; given the restrictions these articles are actually rather successful, despite their 'scientific' limitations. Requirements for *samizdat* publications were clearly far less strict, although they were themselves illegal. At least in the modern versions of the books written at this time, citations and footnotes are extensive. Nonetheless, given stylistic similarities between *Son of Man* and these early articles, it is difficult to claim that Men was forced to significantly adapt his style to censure.

Due to a change of direction at the journal in 1963, Men was no longer asked to write for it, and his final article on Liberius of Rome was published in 1966 after a hiatus of three years. This can be seen as a precursor to the second period (1968-1980) of Men's creative development, which is characterised by active collaboration with the Brussels publishing house, *La Vie avec Dieu* (*tamizdat*).[201]

In 1968, *Son of Man* was first published in Brussels, the first four volumes of *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life* were edited and readied for publication (Bibliography 1.1.2), and Men's doctoral thesis was largely complete. Increased engagement and correspondence with foreigners during this period made for increased access to foreign theological materials. These books and articles extended Men's bibliographies and caused him to add substantial footnotes and appendices to works already completed. Many of these additional notes are of a

[200] Ellis, Jane, *The Russian Orthodox Church: A Contemporary History* (London: Routledge, 1986), 158-159.
[201] Колупаев В.Е. Брюссельское издательство <Жизнь с Богом>: Книжный мир Русского Зарубежья XX века Радиомиссия для советских слушателей. Saarbrücken: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing, 2012.

more ‘academic’ nature than the texts to which they are appended. The ability to publish abroad also seems to have reduced the actuality of *samizdat* circulation. The key works of this period are the remaining ‘religious histories’, the final two volumes of *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life: Messengers* (Bibliography 1.1.2.5) and *Threshold* (Bibliography 1.1.2.6) and the incomplete *The First Apostles* (Bibliography 1.1.3). By 1980, *Son of Man* and *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life,* were more or less complete in the forms in which they are now available.

Towards the end of the 1970s, Men added to these ‘religious histories’ the trilogy provisionally entitled *Life in the Church*. The content of these works corresponds with some articles published abroad during the 1970s in *Die Stimme der Orthodoxie* and *Vestnik,* the journal of the Russian Christian Movement in Paris. An early version of the first volume of the ‘trilogy’ on Sacrament and liturgy, *Heaven on Earth,* had been published as early as 1969 by *La Vie avec Dieu*, but the material developed during the 1970s and a more complete edition, *Sacrament, Word and Image,* followed in 1980. Notes for the second volume on the Bible (published in an early form in 1976) and the third on prayer seem to have been subject to further revision after 1980. Both works have been published by Men’s followers together with extra materials since his death: the versions differ substantially in scope from the notes left by Men himself for these developing bodies of material. During Men’s lifetime, some materials for *How to Read the Bible* seem to have found their way into the commentaries for *The Brussels Bible:* although the ‘trilogy’ appears to have been largely abandoned as a concept after 1980, materials were expanded and reused.

Increased interest in Men’s publishing activities from the KGB and a change in style demanded by the requirements of a new generation[202] led to a change in direction. Men now

[202] Масленикова З.А. Жизнь отца Александра Меня, 467.

had to be very cautious about sending materials to *La Vie avec Dieu* for publication abroad. In around 1980 he moved away from both his 'religious histories' and compilations of material for his parishioners in book form.

Thus, from around 1980 to 1987 we can legitimately speak of a third period in Men's creative development. The substantial works *Dictionary of Biblical Studies* and *Isagogics* date from this period, as well as Men's most intensive labours on the commentary for *The Brussels Bible.* The first two of these were first published more than ten years after Men's death and the third was published anonymously a number of times by *La Vie avec Dieu*, the final and most extensive publication of which took place in 1989. Men's authorship of these Bible commentaries remains contested as a consequence of anonymity. To these substantial volumes may be added a number of articles of an 'academic' nature on aspects of biblical studies, such as *Concerning the History of Russian Orthodox Biblical Studies* and *On the Biblical Prophets*. Although the works of this third period are discussed least of all in the secondary literature, they present the greatest interest of all for the present study, as they are original, analytical and specifically concerned with biblical exegesis and interpretation. References are plentiful, material that would earlier have been included in appendices is incorporated into the main text and original research is in evidence, especially where the author considers the history of biblical studies in Russia in his *Dictionary* and various articles. Between 1980 and 1987, Men lacked opportunities for publication and therefore set himself free from self-imposed apologetic concerns. This change in direction inadvertently increased the academic rigour of his research.

This third period was also perhaps most significant for Men's correspondence, *besedy*, sermons and slide films, many of which have subsequently been made available in print and

online. Although he could not publish, he took all the opportunities he had to present the Christian faith. The more personal nature of such 'works' provides interesting counterpoint to and commentary on the more 'academic' works of Men's third period. Some, such as those combined to create a commentary on the Apocalypse, are theologically substantial, and invite interesting comparison with *Dictionary* articles on similar themes. Men's 'besedy' provided a template for the more famous lectures he gave between 1988 and 1990.

A fourth period comprised roughly two and a half years from the beginning of 1988 to his death on 9th September 1990. The unprecedented opportunities of Gorbachev's tenure resulted in substantial increases in the breadth of topics considered and new methods of presentation. His hectic schedule during this period has already been alluded to (1.1.4): hundreds of lectures were given, and many tens of articles published in the different Soviet journals that would never before have accepted his work. As well as exhibiting greater thematic diversity, 'works' from this fourth period are short. No substantial new 'works' were produced and printed in book format between 1988 and 1990, although Men managed to prepare a new version of *Son of Man* for publication in 1990. Men focused his attention instead on short articles, lectures and interviews. The collection *A Hard Path to Dialogue,* prepared by Men, but only published posthumously, contained many articles on social, political and philosophical themes. The articles presented were substantial and of high quality, although usually concerned with questions of the *glasnost'/perestroika* period. Predein gives the following comment.

> The mood of the book is very calm and sober-minded, in some ways even untypical for Fr. Aleksandr. If he turns to a striking contemporary event (conflict in Karabakh, or the 500th anniversary of the discovery of America), he uses it only as an occasion for historiosophic assimilation.... In this collection there are almost no extravagant claims, no scintillating emotions, and no missionary activities. Instead, Fr. Aleksandr acts as a thoughtful historian, a level-headed and serious analyst, able to think on a large scale and see the ways of Providence in the most diverse and complicated

histories.[203]

Men's more 'thoughtful' and 'level-headed' style is not specific to this fourth period. It had developed earlier in the period of government repression between 1980 and 1987. Also, even in this last period, despite the variety of materials he considered, Men did not forget biblical studies. Articles from 1988-1990 include an introduction to Kuznetsova's Russian-language translation of the Gospel of Mark, introductions to two Russian-language translations of Ecclesiastes, the articles *The World of the Bible* and *In Search of the Genuine Christ*. These 'biblical' articles are stylistically distant from the early 'literary' articles published in the *Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate,* although they cover some of the same ground. They have a more 'analytical' character, similar to the articles published in *A Hard Path to Dialogue,* and the 'academic' works of 1980-1987, but unfortunately they have not generally been the subject of much attention in secondary literature.

His lectures, have, however been discussed in greater detail. Daniel devotes discussions, for example, to the lecture series on *Russian Religious Philosophy*[204] and the lectures *The Bible and Literature*,[205] as well as the lecture *Two Ways of Understanding Christianity*.[206] The lectures on *Russian Religious Philosophy* have even been translated into English,[207] and *Two Ways of Understanding* was included in the English-language collection edited by Shukman and Roberts.[208] Although these lectures are of undoubted historical interest as the first of their kind in the Soviet Union, they should not be seen as core sources for establishing Men's theology due to their spontaneous and apologetic nature.

---

[203] Предеин Д.прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как выдающийся православный катехизатор.... 60-61.
[204] Daniel, Wallace, *Russia's Uncommon Prophet,* 255-262.
[205] Daniel, Wallace, *Russia's Uncommon Prophet,* 270-281.
[206] Daniel, Wallace, *Russia's Uncommon Prophet,* 264-268.
[207] Men, Alexander (Fr.) *Russian Religious Philosophy: 1989-1990 Lectures,* translated S. Janos (Fr.), (Mohrsville PA: frsj publications, 2015).
[208] Roberts, Elizabeth and Ann Shukman (eds.), *Christianity for the Twenty-First Century: The Prophetic Writings of Alexander Men,* (New York: Continuum, 1996), 151-163.

In summary, for the purposes of the present study, the works of Men's second and third periods are of the greatest significance. The works of the third period include *Isagogics,* the 1790 articles of *Dictionary of Biblical Studies,* Men's commentaries for *the Brussels Bible* and a number of substantial articles on biblical studies that have not previously been considered in detail. Although less directly related to biblical studies, the 'religious histories' (primarily *Son of Man* and *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life*), completed by Men in his second period include substantial discussions of biblical themes and their interpretation. Men's *Life in the Church* trilogy, various late articles from the fourth period concerned with biblical studies and artistic interpretations of Scripture, and references in Men's correspondence should also be considered authoritative sources, but are shorter and generally contain less information. Lectures, *besedy*, and interviews may also be referred to where appropriate, but their authority as sources for Men's theological views is secondary.

1.2.3) The Themes of Aleksandr Men's Most Significant 'Works'

After having established a hierarchy of authority among the very large number of works by Aleksandr Men, it will be helpful to briefly consider the themes of the most significant of these. 'Most significant' is, of course, a debatable term: here we simply refer to the fact that Men spent more time working on five of his works than on any others. These should be given interpretive priority on the basis of his sustained interest in their development.

Chronologically, the first of these works is *Son of Man,* which in its most recent form runs close to five hundred pages. This is Men's attempt at writing a work in the 'Life of Jesus' genre (4.2), something that he considered a task of particular responsibility, a fact borne out

by his multiple revisions of the work over the course of around forty years. Although it is intended as a work of popular apologetics rather than 'academic' theology, it is still of relevance for any discussion of Men's christological thought, including the nature of the concept of divine-humanity and his interpretations of the Gospels. Eighty pages of appendices discuss some of the critical questions of New Testament Studies surrounding the life of Christ.

The second work is his six-volume history of pre-Christian religions, entitled *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life.* This occupied him for much of the 60s and 70s and its most recent publication runs to over three thousand pages. Like *Son of Man,* as a 'religious history' it is ultimately a work of popular apologetics, despite substantial footnotes and appendices of a more 'academic' nature. It is, however, with its rather unwieldy structure, less successful than *Son of Man* as a 'popular' work*,* with the exception of the fifth volume, *Messengers,* which is a lucid and highly effective presentation of Old Testament prophetism. Posthumous publications of the whole series have consequently been more infrequent than of *Son of Man*. The work does, however, present some of Men's key theological ideas, developed from 'Russian school' thought, such as the contrast between 'magic' and 'monotheism' (Bulgakov, *Unfading Light*) and his interpretation of the biblical theme of 'covenant', the Old Testament church, divine-humanity and the role of prophetism. Sections of the second volume concerned with the Pentateuch, the whole of the fifth volume and sections of the sixth volume concerned with Wisdom literature, apocalyptic literature and the inter-testamental period interpret biblical texts. The expansive sections concerned with the religious cultures of Egypt, Babylon, India, China, Greece and Rome present the spiritual and cultural background to the divine-human narrative revealed in the Bible. The first volume, *Wellsprings*, is of a different character to the others, and lays a philosophical and epistemological foundation.

With its focus on philosophical theology, it is unique in Men's output, and has hermeneutical implications.

The third work, *Isagogics,* was intended as a textbook for seminary students at the Moscow Theological Academy (although rejected for this purpose in 1983). It provides information on the sources of Men's approach to exegesis, especially in its eighty-page introduction, thus shedding new light on Men's approach to topics already discussed in *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life.* The ideas of 'Russian school' figure Anton Kartashev on the critical stances that should be adopted by the Orthodox Church are discussed in the work, and are to be especially noted.[209] Overall, *Isagogics* is a six-hundred-page work of impressive clarity designed to aid Old Testament exegesis, as demonstrated by the inclusion of questions of students at the end of each chapter. Although its genesis remains something of enigma, due to a lack of discussion in the secondary literature, a work of this size and substance must have taken considerable time and effort to produce. Thus it should be taken seriously as an expression of Men's theological thought.

The fourth work, Men's *Dictionary of Biblical Studies*, is scarcely less substantial than the six-volume *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life,* while avoiding the 'popular' character of the latter. It contains 1790 articles on the most varied topics within the field of biblical studies; Men lists in his Introduction to the *Dictionary* twenty-eight different kinds of entries.[210] Of these, the most significant for the present study are concerned with the canonical and non-canonical books of the Bible,[211] translations of the Bible, the different fields of biblical studies, questions of divine inspiration and interpretation, artists

[209] Мень А.прот. Исагогика: Курс по изучению священного писания: Ветхий завет. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2003. 63-64. Roza Adamyants (2015) discusses Kartashev's significance for Men: Роза Адамянц. "Отец Александр Мень и его отношение к библейской критике": https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CpKv4BTP4DM [Accessed 18/05/2018].

[210] Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том первый. 10-11.

[211] The 'Deutero-Canonical' books.

representing biblical themes and the many exegetes from different periods of church history. A few aspects of this dictionary are a little surprising. First, although a reader might gain the impression from *Son of Man, In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life,* and *Isagogics,* that Men was interested only in the Old Testament and Christ as presented in the Gospels, to the exclusion of other parts of the New Testament, *Dictionary* shows that this is not true. The most substantial article of all discusses Paul's Letters. Men, it appears, became increasingly fascinated by the writings and life of Paul from the mid-1970s onwards, when he created an icon of Paul,[212] and started work on *The First Apostles.*[213] *Dictionary* also includes substantial articles on James, 1-2 Peter, 1-3 John, Jude and Revelation. Second, Men's articles on individual exegetes not only highlight Russian thought, as Men himself claims in his *Introduction*, but above all the interpretation of the so-called 'Russian School' of philosophical theology, which remains controversial in Orthodox circles. Thus, some of the most substantial articles are neither concerned with well-known Western theologians, nor figures of the Russian Orthodox establishment, but such philosophers as Vladimir Solov′ev, Sergei Trubetskoi, Nikolai Berdyaev and Sergei Bulgakov. Although Metropolitan Filaret (Drozdov) is discussed at length, as would be expected, there are no entries for the exponents of the so-called 'Neo-Patristic synthesis' (G. Florovsky or V. Lossky). Equally surprisingly, there is an entry for Thomas Aquinas, but no entry for that perceived cornerstone of Orthodox theology, Gregory Palamas. In some ways, the exclusion of certain figures tells us as much about Men's theological interests as the inclusion of others.

Given the huge amount of research that has evidently been incorporated in this *Dictionary,* the Alexander Men Foundation sought to preempt questions of authenticity in its introduction

[212] Двадцать лет без отца Александра Меня. И с ним. 184.

[213] Men also wrote a short English-language article on Paul's theology: 'The Messianic Eschatology of St. Paul in Connexion with the Primitive Preaching of the Gospel', ed. A. Vanhoye, *L'apôtre Paul: Personnalité, Style et Conception du Ministère: Extrait,* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1986), 322-3 (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensum 73).

to the 2002 publication in three volumes.

> Working on the dictionary, Fr. Aleksandr as far as was possible involved translators, editors, technical assistants, and asked for others to find materials for various articles. As a rule, the helpers were parishioners of the Sretenskii Church in Novaya Derevnya, to whom he was boundlessly thankful. But, undoubtedly, the main part of the work he completed himself. Fr. Aleksandr collected, reworked and made sense of the most varied material....[214]

This seems plausible given the evident scarcity of individuals who could have envisioned and realised such a work in the Soviet Union in the early 1980s. Overall, the significance of this work and its posthumous publication for biblical studies in Russia is only beginning to be realised. Batalden calls it a 'symbolic' representation of the "recovery of pre-revolutionary Russian scholarship in biblical studies",[215] and Adamyants devoted a lecture to it in 2017.[216]

The fifth work is the commentaries for *The Brussels Bible.*[217] Although this was published anonymously, it is clear from Maslenikova's accounts that Men spent a lot of time preparing materials for these commentaries and sending them to *La Vie avec Dieu*. They are substantial, accounting for around seven hundred pages of the most recent editions of this study Bible and cover the whole Bible.

Many have claimed that the commentaries were written in their entirety by Men, with perhaps a few editorial changes introduced by the publishing house. Konstantin Parkhomenko, for example, claims on the basis of a conversation with Men's wife Nataliya that these commentaries were written by Men, but 'corrected' by *La Vie avec Dieu* in order to correspond with Catholic rather than Orthodox interpretations.[218] Others are less extravagant

---

[214] Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том первый. 7.
[215] Batalden, Stephen, *Russian Bible Wars*, 204.
[216] Роза Адамянц. Значение Библиологического словаря о. А. Меня: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jg62prG-D44 [Accessed 21/05/2018].
[217] For example, in Библия. Книги Священного Писания. Ветхого и Нового Завета в Синодальном переводе с комментариями и приложениями. М.: Российское Библейское общество, 2017.
[218] https://azbyka.ru/forum/threads/o-biblii-s-kommentarijami.837/ [Accessed 18.04.2018].

in their claims, although evidence is rarely advanced one way or the other. Andreev and Yudin, in their work on the publishing house *La Vie avec Dieu*, helpfully summarise the difficulties of establishing the extent of Aleksandr Men's involvement in the publication of this study Bible.

> Fr Aleksandr Men remarked [in his *Dictionary*] that "the whole corpus of appendices [prilozheniya] to this Study [tolkovyi] Bible was put together by the editorship of the publisher *La vie avec dieu*, primarily according to the Jerusalem Bible, but also on the basis of the material of certain authors, both Orthodox and Catholic. The ecumenical character of the publication is connected with the direction of the publisher, which strives to promote dialogue between Orthodox and Catholic". The comments of Fr. Aleksandr Men about the fact that in addition to the Jerusalem Bible at the basis of the whole corpus of the Brussels publication were placed the materials of "certain authors, both Orthodox and Catholic" presents itself as especially significant for one simple reason. One of these Orthodox authors was Fr. Aleksandr Men himself. Assertions that this famous Orthodox pastor, biblical scholar and apologete was a participant in the publication of the Brussels Bible are widespread. Thinking varies, however, about what his concrete contribution in the creation of the commentaries and appendices actually was. Some sources hold that "the commentaries, printed in the Brussels Bible, are the commentaries of Fr. Aleksandr Men", while others limit his contribution to commentary on certain books of the Old Testament, for example the Pentateuch and the prophets, and also the creation of indices for and interpretations of the New Testament.[219]

While Men disavowed claims of full authorship in his *Dictionary of Biblical Studies,*[220] the director of *La Vie avec Dieu*, Irina Posnova, said that Men was responsible for changes to the commentaries in the Bible from 1976 onwards.[221] The most appropriate interpretation of such a claim is that Men had overall editing authority for the publication of the study Bible, while it is still entirely possible that others also continued to contribute. Pavel Men remarks that his brother sent constant corrections and additions to the publisher up until the fourth edition of 1989, which he (Aleksandr Men) approved fully.[222] Considerable similarities in the materials used for certain parts of the commentaries in the *Brussels Bible* and Men's *How to Read the Bible* are also interesting,[223] but clearly do not establish Men's authorship of the whole commentary, with all introductions to the individual books. One thing is clear, however:

---

[219] Андреев Г., Юдин А. Жизнь с Богом: Брюссель–Москва. М.: Культурно-просветительский центр «Духовная библиотека», 2013, 137.
[220] Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том третий. 249-250.
[221] Андреев Г., Юдин А. Жизнь с Богом... 138.
[222] Андреев Г., Юдин А. Жизнь с Богом... 138.
[223] For example, compare commentaries on Genesis 1.

whatever Men's precise role in the publication of this study Bible, he took overall responsibility for and approved the contents of the fourth and final edition in 1989. On this basis, it is sensible to conclude that the commentaries broadly represent his own theological views, even if it is difficult to definitely attribute any particular passage to Men himself. At the very least, Men played a substantial and perhaps decisive role in the production of a study Bible that became one of the most important publications for the reception of the Bible in the Post-Soviet period.[224]

1.2.4) Summary

This discussion of Men's works has established a methodology for determining which are the most relevant to the present study. First, considerations of genre show us that his books, articles and correspondence are likely to be the most reliable expressions of his theological thought, although his *besedy* and lectures help in elucidating their themes. Second, the periodisation of Men's work shows the most significant works come primarily from the periods 1968-1980 and 1980-1987, although the latter is not a period to which much attention has been paid. These are to form the basic material for discussion in the present study. Third, simply assessing the five 'works' that Men appears to have spent most time writing shows us that these are very closely concerned with biblical studies and interpretation of the Bible, if not quite exclusively so. Throughout these five works, Men clearly demonstrates that his most decisive influences in biblical exegesis and interpretation come from the varied thought of the 'Russian school' figures. Overall, the interest Men shows in certain Russian philosophers and aspects of biblical criticism is wholly consistent with the biographical portrayal of his intellectual development and interests in (1.1): the study of the Bible is

[224] Vladimir Zelinskii calls this the most significant publication by La vie avec Dieu: Зелинский В. "206 Avenue De La Couronne" – Христианос, 1998.(VII), 242.

important and its interpretation is christocentric, drawing on the ideas of the 'Russian school'.

1.3) General Summary

Contextualising Men's approach to biblical interpretation from the perspective of both biography and literary corpus has provided us with an overview of Men's theological and pastoral concerns, together with a methodology for approaching his works.

Men was strongly interested in educating as many people as he could concerning the nature of the Bible and its message and realised that this task required a plurality of approaches. This is evident both from the various biographical accounts of his pastoral ministry and his legacy in the discipline of Russian-language Bible translation, a subset of the broader discipline of biblical interpretation, where both literary-artistic and 'popular' translations have their place. Given this, characterising Men as 'an interpreter of the Bible' seems both plausible and productive. His methods of biblical interpretation were most closely aligned with those of the 'Russian school' rather than the later writers of the West. He took from these authors not only a hermeneutic, but a divine-human biblical theology that offered a universalising christocentric narrative for Scripture. Men was interested in both personal transformation through a living encounter with Christ, and the transformation of the culture in which he found himself into what may be termed a divine-human culture, the ultimate reality.

These concerns show themselves in Men's 'works', the most significant of which are concerned with interpreting the Bible and making its message understandable to as many

people as possible. In the next three chapters, Men's books and articles will be referred to most of all, and special weight will be given to the views expressed in the five works: *Son of Man, In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life, Isagogics, Dictionary of Biblical Studies,* and Men's commentaries for the Brussels Bible. Men's written contribution to Biblical Studies was substantial, although of varied genre, and the periodisation of his works indicates that some of the least well-known materials are actually his most significant. In the most significant works, 'Russian school' thought is used as an intellectual basis for biblical interpretation, which unsurprisingly lends a 'universalistic pathos' to the biblical theology espoused in *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life.*

2) Aleksandr Men and 'Russian Orthodox' Biblical Interpretation

After a general discussion of the place of biblical interpretation in Men's biography and writings in Chapter One, we shall now take a closer look at his interpretive procedures. The methodology of this chapter is to begin by considering Men's thought on biblical interpretation alongside the approaches of the Russian Orthodox Church. This can be seen as both a comparative study and a form of contextualisation, which seeks to establish Men's place in the history of Russian Orthodox biblical interpretation. An ambiguity occurs because Men is at the same time both a controversial exegete in some quarters and perhaps the first Russian Orthodox writer of the modern period to attempt to give an account of the history of Russian Orthodox biblical interpretation in his *Dictionary* and the article *Concerning the History of Russian Orthodox Biblical Studies*.[225] Classically, the Eastern Churches allowed considerable latitude with respect to interpretive procedures. Yonatan Moss writes on the preservation of exegetical texts in Greek by the 'heresiarch' Severus of Antioch. "A commonly held, but simplistic conception of late antique Christianity is that it was a culture obsessed with theological exclusivity. We must not forget, however, that this culture was equally fascinated with exegetical inclusivity".[226] Yet in Men's case there is considerable continuity between his interpretive procedures and the biblical theology that rests on them. Therefore, despite claiming the Greek Patristic and Byzantine traditions as authoritative in matters of faith, Men's Russian Orthodox critics, for example Vladimir Volgin,[227] Konstantin Bufeev[228] and Roman Vershillo,[229] appear to have limited interest in such exegetical

[225] Bibliography 1.2.23. Мень А.прот. К истории русской православной библеистики. - Навстречу Христу. М: Жизнь с Богом, 2009.

[226] Moss, Yonatan, 'Saving Severus: How Severus of Antioch's Writings Survived in Greek', *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 56 (2016) 785-808: 807.

[227] The 'spiritual father' of Dmitrii Medvedev, and the head priest of a large church in central Moscow: Духовные внуки. Огонек. 30.12.2007 at https://www.kommersant.ru/doc/2300073 [Accessed 18/06/2018]. From Men's 1984 letters to Volgin we know he was originally one of Men's parishioners.

[228] Буфеев К. Отец Александр Мень: сказочник или сочинитель апокпифов?: http://www.blagogon.ru/articles/243/ [Accessed 19/09/2018].

[229] Вершилло, Р. о. Мень, Александр Вольфович: https://antimodern.ru/Men-alexandr/ [Accessed 19/09/2018].

inclusivity, because they suspect certain unacceptable dogmatic presuppositions are masquerading as exegetical opinions.

The question of hermeneutics is critical: do the interpretive principles to be used in exegesis fall in the category of theology or exegesis? If they are underpinned by theology, then clearly we should seek a 'Russian Orthodox' approach to biblical interpretation that can be regarded not simply as one option among many, but as True. The polemic between Volgin and Men (2.1.1.1) can be seen in this light. Both believe they are appealing to the 'Russian Orthodox' tradition of biblical interpretation, yet their 'Russian Orthodox' approaches are radically different, because they appeal to tradition in different ways. The uncritical appeal to the 'Fathers' exhibited in the writings of Men's opponents is, it must be recognised at the outset, far more problematic than they assume. The Patristic material itself requires hermeneutical principles for its interpretation, since it exceeds the size of the biblical material many times. Men's opponents also ignore apologetics insofar as they refuse to engage with the scientific and humanistic disciplines of modern academia. Men addresses both of these issues.

Although criticised by conservative author Aleksei Petukhov, Men's article *Concerning the History of Russian Orthodox Biblical Studies* (especially parts 2-12) was used by Alexander Negrov as a major source in his substantial English-language study *Biblical Interpretation in the Russian Orthodox Church.* This historical account of 'Russian Orthodox' biblical interpretation is subjected to analysis in 2.1.2.

2.1.3 refers especially to Men's *Dictionary* and *Isagogics* to illustrate with greater detail Men's views on three significant topics: divine inspiration, isagogics and hermeneutics, and we shall see that Men's exegetical principles are inclusive enough to incorporate the ideas of

controversial ‘Russian school’ figures.

The second part of this chapter considers the four rules for biblical interpretation set out in part one of Men’s article: the Patristic principle (2.2.1), the divine-human principle (2.2.2), the ecclesial principle (2.2.3) and the polysemantic principle (2.2.4). The discussion draws on Men’s other major works, especially his *Dictionary* and *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life* to demonstrate how he himself applies these rules.

Men’s use of ‘Russian school’ figures, such as Vladimir Solov′ev, Anton Kartashev and Mikhail Tareev, not only as a source for exegetical views, but exegetical principles, lends a very inclusive shading to his own view of what ‘Russian Orthodox biblical interpretation’ should be. Its methodologies should be pluralistic, and it should not be afraid to engage with historical and archaeological studies, but it also must work within the framework of a coherent biblical theology.

2.1) Perceptions of ‘Russian Orthodox’ Biblical Interpretation

2.1.1) Russian Orthodox Assessments of Aleksandr Men’s Biblical Interpretation

A discussion of two figures, Vladimir Volgin and Dmitrii Predein, who have written specifically on Men’s approach to biblical interpretation now serves as an introduction to the general principles he used. Both are Russian Orthodox priests and both present us with a rather ‘static’ account of Men’s interpretive principles based on a comparison with what they consider to be the historical approaches of the Orthodox Church. Volgin is, however, considerably more antagonistic than Predein.

2.1.1.1) Vladimir Volgin

Vladimir Volgin, who at one point was a parishioner of Men, wrote under the pseudonym Sergei Antiminsov an article entitled *Protopresbyter Aleksandr Men as a Commentator of the Holy Scriptures*.[230] In this, he takes examples of Men's exegesis from *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life* and *Son of Man* and compares them with corresponding Patristic commentaries. In his epilogue, subtitled *A Theology of Chaos, the Path to the "Universal Religion" of the Antichrist,* he concludes "the books of Fr. Aleksandr act destructively on the very principles of Orthodoxy".[231]

The article, for the most part, does not concern itself with Men's methodology, but prefers to engage in the piecemeal deconstruction of his views. Since it was written and published after Men's death, Men was unable to respond. Volgin had, however, written similar criticisms in personal letters to Men in 1984, and two polemical letters from Aleksandr Men to Vladimir Volgin exist, which attempt to clarify aspects of Men's methodology. They take great care to present it as genuinely 'Russian Orthodox'.

Volgin wrote personalised rhetoric, not cool-headed analysis, and Men's response, although generally analytical in nature, expresses resentment. "From a thousand pages that I have written you search out those places that seem to you 'unorthodox'", he says.[232] The role of the Fathers in Scriptural interpretation is a matter of particular contention. Volgin favours understanding them as something like a 'static' body of interpretive knowledge that should be

[230] Антиминсов С.прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как комментатор священного писания. - Протоиерей Александр Мень как комментатор священного писания. Санкт-Петербург: Общество памяти игумении Таисии, 2006, 3-52.
[231] Антиминсов С.прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как комментатор священного писания, 52.
[232] Мень А.прот. Два письма Владимиру Волгину.

applied to Scripture when reading it. Indeed, Volgin believes that the only valid interpretations of scriptural texts are those of the Fathers.

Volgin does not seem interested in considering his own methodology. Appeals to 'Patristic thought' do not show concern for defining what 'Patristic thought' is,[233] or what kind of ecclesial authority it has. He cites certain Patristic authors, such as Gregory of Nyssa and Ephraim the Syrian, but this is essentially mere proof-texting intended to maintain a literal interpretation of various scriptural accounts. Men's approach treats the Fathers as human beings, who themselves approached Scripture with certain presumptions and sought to reflect on it in a way that made sense in their context.

Men, indeed, tends not to treat 'the Fathers' as a single entity, but as individuals of authority who should be cited when what they have to say is of relevance. Men's only general appeal to 'the Fathers' concerns Volgin's claim that Men wrote books to the detriment of his pastoral ministry. "If literary-theological work was incompatible with pastoral ministry, the Fathers of the Church, to whom you appeal all the time, would have written nothing. But they give an example to all who have this calling".[234] Volgin advises that Men should stop writing and listen to the Fathers, but the Fathers actually provide a model for Men as an author.

Due to the fact that Volgin understands the nature of Patristic interpretation in a 'static' manner, his understanding of the nature of Scripture is also 'static' and 'literalist'. He criticises Men's inclusion of a human element into the nature of Scripture. In reply Men, actually on the basis of Patristic texts, criticises the view that the Bible is only the Word of God and nothing else. Many Church Fathers did not believe it was simply dictated by the

[233] For example, Антиминсов С.прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как комментатор священного писания, 19.

[234] Мень А.прот. Два письма Владимиру Волгину.

Holy Spirit to human writers. He cites as evidence Augustine's *City of God* 17:6, which says, "speaking through a man, He speaks as a man, and in this sense seeks us",[235] and John Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis* 3:3*,* which, in the Russian edition,[236] speaks of "condescension to human ways". Even Jesus, according to Men, allowed for human involvement in the writing of Scripture in Matthew 19:8 when he claimed that scriptural allowances for divorce were originally conceived by Moses as the result of human hard-heartedness. Jesus makes biblical ethics contingent upon human character.

Furthermore, the Fathers at times emphasised stylistic differences between the biblical authors,[237] which can only be interpreted as a human component in scriptural authorship. Then on the basis of intra-textual evidence it is clear that biblical authors used various sources available to them, thus negating the argument for direct dictation ("Book of Jashar" in Joshua 10:13, "Book of the Annals of the Kings of Israel" in 2 Kings 1:18 and Luke's research in Luke 1:1-4). More controversially, Men claims that there are certain factual errors in biblical books that in no way diminish their scriptural authority. The Book of Daniel, for example, claims that Darius was the direct successor of Nebuchadnezzar, when in fact it was Nabonides. Essentially, in all of these things, the Fathers are accentuating not only that the Bible is the 'Word of God', but that it has a divine-human nature.

In the *Orthodox Encyclopedia,* released with the permission of the Church censor, "the presence of different kinds of inaccuracy, historical, chronological and topographical, as well as disagreements between the holy authors" is recognised (vol. 2, p. 736). This fact shows that by divine example, they were given to be genuine co-authors with the Spirit, preserving all the peculiarities of their human nature.[238]

In Men's polemic against Volgin, there is a greater emphasis on patristic texts and intra-

[235] http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/120117.htm [Accessed 20/06/2018].
[236] https://azbyka.ru/otechnik/Ioann_Zlatoust/tolk_01/3 [Accessed 18/06/2018].
[237] St. Jerome, *Commentary on Isaiah: including St. Jerome's translation of Origen's homilies 1-9 on Isaiah,* trans. Thomas P. Scheck (New York: Newman Press, 2015).
[238] Мень А.прот. Два письма Владимиру Волгину.

biblical evidence than elsewhere in his writing, as these are sources he believes should be authoritative for Volgin. The application of the concept 'divine-humanity' does not merely provoke an interesting Patristic analogy, however, but creates an ecclesial foundation for critical research. Men, following Kartashev,[239] emphasises that scientific methodologies are required for investigating the human aspect of the biblical texts.

Men adds a few significant voices to his polemic in support of a revised isagogics. These include Sové and Kartashev (2.2.1-2), but his letter also briefly refers to Sergei Trubetskoi (1862-1905) and Boris Turaev (1868-1920) as the founders of Russian-language biblical criticism. Sergei Trubetskoi's biblical theology (Chapter Three) is of great importance to Men. Boris Turaev supported the introduction of critical methods into biblical studies, but taught in a pre-revolutionary theological school in Russia and took part in the 1917-1918 Local Council of the Russian Orthodox Church, and so had some ecclesial authority. Turaev developed the divine-human principle to claim that biblical authorship should be understood not in the modern sense of authorship, but in the context of the thought of the Ancient East, where literary ownership was not recognised. In Turaev, Men could present Volgin with a Russian Orthodox archaeologist who accepted the value of biblical criticism[240] and the Documentary Hypothesis.[241] He is frequently cited both in *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life* and *Isagogics*.[242] Men's claims to Volgin that now "the conceptions of this [biblical critical] school are generally accepted" and that not "a single Orthodox (or Catholic) biblical scholar would have a different view"[243] are undoubtedly overstatements, however.

[239] Карташев А.прот. Ветхозаветнная библейская критика. Париж: YMCA-Press, 1947.
[240] Мень А.прот. Исагогика. 53.
[241] Мень А.прот. Исагогика. 93.
[242] Turaev was not, however, a major source for Men's biblical views in the same way as Trubetskoi. Although a number of Turaev's emphases, such as the significance of Amos' prophetism, the personal aspect of Jeremiah's ministry and the importance of prophetism find parallels in Men's writing, others such as Turaev's negative view of Ezekiel and apocalyptic literature, his distinction between the authorship of Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah, and his chronology of the events of Ezra and Nehemiah do not. Тураев Б.А. История древнего востока. Том II. Ленинград: Социально-экономическое издательство, 1936. 69,73,185-6,192-193.
[243] Мень А.прот. Два письма Владимиру Волгину.

In Men's letters to Volgin, we are introduced to some of the basic principles of his approach to biblical interpretation. He attempts to justify a number of new exegetical results by appealing to the writings of the Fathers, intra-textual scriptural evidence, and the ecclesial acceptance of isagogic views based on biblical criticism. In the process he introduces the idea of 'divine-humanity' (2.2.2) in order to explain the nature of the divine inspiration of Scripture. It is significant that Men claims not just that his views are supported by the biblical evidence and modern 'scientific' thought, but that true Patristic (2.2.1) and ecclesial authority (2.2.3) are on his side.

2.1.1.2) Dmitrii Predein

In his recent (2015) Russian-language theological study of Men's writings, Predein includes a chapter on Men's biblical studies, thus becoming the second figure after Volgin to consider the matter in detail. He is more complimentary than Volgin, seeing Men as a biblical commentator without contemporary comparison in the Russian language.[244] Nonetheless, his reticence in subjecting the term 'Russian Orthodox biblical interpretation' to sufficient criticism leads his study into contradiction. While Predein assumes it is clear what the Russian Orthodox approach to biblical interpretation actually is, he is equally clear that Men fell victim, perhaps due to the limitations of his context, to an equivocal dependence on Western biblical studies.[245] Predein understands that this enkindles suspicion among more conservative commentators; he notes Volgin and Sysoev in particular. He believes equally, however, that these conservatives have been too quick to dismiss Men's written corpus.

[244] Предеин Д.прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как выдающийся православный катехизатор... 268.
[245] See Предеин Д.прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как выдающийся православный катехизатор... 233.

Understanding the precise manner in which Men is 'dependant on Western biblical studies' is not so straightforward. If we take, for example, Men's 'demythologising' view that Old Testament miracles should not be treated literally as historical events, the precise source for Men's view is difficult to ascertain. Predein's evidence for this is found in Men's *beseda Why is it Hard for Me to Believe in God?*[246]

> In the Old Testament many descriptions of miracles are only poetic metaphors. This is because the Old Testament is... a complicated system of genres, and when it says that the mountains leap[247] and so forth, we should not understand this literally. It is the language of poetry, sagas, sayings and legends.

This incorporation of what Predein would pejoratively call 'rationalism', of course, brings Men closer to the Liberal Protestant tradition from Schleiermacher's *The Christian Faith* onwards, than to the Church Fathers whose pre-Enlightenment interpretations may more readily be characterised by a combination of literalism and symbolism, but questions remain. Are Men's 'rationalist' sources Western or Russian? Men had great respect for 'Russian school' figures, many of whom interacted with the West and held similar views at the turn of the twentieth century. 2.2 considers further how Men based his interpretive principles on the thought of Solov′ev and others. Can it even be conclusively shown that Men's conservative critics are any less dependent on Western sources than either Men or the 'Russian school' thinkers? Men believes that biblical literalists have imported a form of Monophysitism from Western Protestant sources (2.2.1-2).

It is instructive that while, for many, Men's biblical interpretation is not 'Orthodox' enough, whatever that might mean, for others (for example Lezov, 1.1.5) it is too 'Orthodox', and insufficiently 'rational' or 'critical', because it still sees 'tradition' as a major factor in

---

[246] Bibliography 1.5.2. This *beseda* was published in an anthology of *besedy*: Мень А.прот. Почему нам трудно поверить в Вода? М: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2005 (переизд. 2008) 7-94, 42. Предеин Д.прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как выдающийся православный катехизатор... 271.

[247] Ps. 114:4,6.

interpretive method. A more neutral assessment would be that Men's biblical scholarship, following the legacy of Solov′ev and others, draws on both 'Russian Orthodox' and Western thought to create a personal synthesis. In Men's case, the synthesis in questions builds on the one achieved earlier by the 'Russian school'.

Unlike other more antagonistic commentators, Predein sees value in this kind of synthesis. While recognising 'rationalist' elements in Men's thought, he is keen to defend Men's originality and clear thinking against Sysoev and Volgin, who, he claims, accused Men of heresy on the basis of "simplified" and "coarse" interpretations.[248] Predein admits that Men was careful to defend his thinking with respect to 'Russian Orthodox' tradition, and the positive result of this was that his biblical interpretation gave much-needed answers to the spiritual questioning of the Soviet people. Predein's summary assessment of Men's biblical interpretation is intriguing, but somewhat opaque. "Of course, the commentaries of Aleksandr Men cannot replace the corpus of Patristic exegesis, but they are fully able to serve as fine additions to it."[249] What kind of "fine additions" Predein has in mind remains unclear. If, as Predein at times appears to suggest, Men's most significant novelty is that he draws on Western, especially Liberal Protestant, biblical thought, then the following question arises. Is Predein claiming that these Liberal Protestant ideas, mediated through Men's work, are "fine additions" to Patristic commentary, and thus helpful for Russian Orthodox biblical reflection? An affirmative answer to this, while arguably consistent with traditional Byzantine tendencies towards exegetical inclusivity would be controversial with conservatives. What is lacking from Predein's account is the requisite critical reflection on what constitutes 'Russian Orthodox biblical interpretation'. For this reason, it is difficult to see precisely how Men relates to the exegetical tradition in which he stands. What is tacitly clear from Predein's

[248] Предеин Д.прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как выдающийся православный катехизатор... 273. Sysoev's accusations of heresy: http://www.blagogon.ru/biblio/725/ [Accessed 07/07/2018].
[249] Предеин Д.прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как выдающийся православный катехизатор... 273.

discussion is that in incorporating Western material, albeit through the filter of 'Orthodox' and Russian philosophical criticism, Men was close to many thinkers of the 'Russian school'.

2.1.2) A Historical Account of 'Russian Orthodox' Biblical Interpretation

What is lacking from the assessments of both Volgin and Predein is an analysis of what 'Russian Orthodox' Biblical Interpretation actually is. In order to provide a narrative of 'Russian Orthodox' biblical interpretation rather than a 'static' set of a priori principles, we need to consider its historical development in the Russian Church. For this we refer to the only English-language work that provides such a narrative, Negrov's *Biblical Interpretation in the Russian Orthodox Church.* Its third chapter gives a detailed historical account of the development of interpretive practices. This work, however, draws significant inspiration (and material) from Men's writings and approach, making any assessment of Men's own interpretation seem circular with respect to the 'Russian Orthodox' approach established.

Comparing Negrov's book with Men's article *Concerning the History of Russian Biblical Studies* suggests considerable commonalities in both material and approach, far more than Negrov's relatively meagre citations indicate. Indeed, Negrov himself essentially admits that his study is an attempt to develop Men's article, by embellishing it with greater detail and addressing a couple of methodological inadequacies.

> ...no synthesis has been made to interlink the Orthodox history of Bible interpretation and hermeneutics. The exception is a short article by Aleksandr Men (d. 1990), "K istorii russkoi pravoslavnoi bibleistiki," published in 1987. In this essay, Men briefly comments on the history of Bible interpretation and supplies his account with brief comments on Orthodox hermeneutics. The study offers detailed bibliographical information and names the major Orthodox expositors of the Bible. Moreover, Men groups the Orthodox exegetes according to their main research interests. There are two main factors, however, that have been insufficiently emphasized in the article. First, Men does not trace the close tie between Orthodox hermeneutics and the methods of interpretation adopted by

Orthodox exegetes.[250] Second, he does not specifically link the history of Bible interpretation in the Orthodox Church with the historical contexts of the Church and society in Russia.[251]

Curiously, this passage suggests that Negrov has not engaged with Men's extensive *Dictionary of Biblical Studies,* which, although not a systematic account, does in its own way address the two concerns. If Men's *Concerning the History of Russian Biblical Studies* is read in conjunction with his *Dictionary,* then we may resolve Negrov's first criticism, since in this more extensive work articles on hermeneutics and methods of interpretation are set alongside and cross-referenced with articles on individual exegetes and their methods. Furthermore, Negrov's second criticism may be resolved when we realise that the *Dictionary* articles on individual exegetes generally include discussions of historical context and articles on different movements in biblical studies attempt to contextualise these same movements, although the reader may, of course, not agree with Men's attempts at historical contextualisation.

Where Negrov cites Men's article in his text, he is usually in agreement with it. Both Men and Negrov note the significance of the formation of the Russian biblical canon towards the end of the fifteenth century; a primary motivation for this was to fight against various heretical notions that had spread from the Byzantine Empire, thus giving Russian Orthodox biblical interpretation a polemical, as opposed to purely theoretical or devotional, nature from the very beginning. Although neither Men nor Negrov give a detailed exposition of the principles of the sixteenth-century Moscow Bible translator, Maximus the Greek,[252] both claim that he "formed the first known system of hermeneutic principles for interpreting the Bible in Russia", in which he emphasised the plurality of Patristic hermeneutical

[250] This, presumably, is the relation between theory and practice.
[251] Negrov, Alexander, *Biblical Interpretation in the Russian Orthodox Church,* 4.
[252] Men gives 1470-1555 as the dates of the life of Maximus, although in other sources his year of birth is unclear and his date of death is 1556 (see, for example, *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, https://www.britannica.com/biography/Maximus-the-Greek [Accessed 16/07/2018]).

approaches.[253] This assertion shows that from the outset Russian Orthodox interpretive principles were dependent on the importation of Western intellectual resources and potentially somewhat heterodox (Maximus the Greek studied with Girolamo Savonarola in Italy[254]). With his Western education and interest in biblical studies, Maximus was something of an outlier with respect to the Russian Christianity of the time, and perhaps it should be no surprise that he was brought to trial then incarcerated in the Trinity Lavra of St. Sergius until his death in 1555/6.[255]

Both Negrov and Men discuss the hermeneutical principles of Metropolitan Platon (Levshin) of Moscow, the next major figure in their common narrative. Platon presided over the introduction in 1798 of the study of hermeneutics as an academic discipline in Moscow Theological Academy. Negrov provides a full exposition and analysis of Platon's nine hermeneutical principles,[256] whereas Men merely states that these principles "demanded that we should search, first of all, for the direct 'historical' meaning of the text, while being careful not to stretch the meaning and look for mystical meaning when it is not there, and likewise set out methods for resolving apparent biblical contradictions."[257] Negrov criticises Platon for a lack of interest in the philological aspects of interpretation, whereas Men only describes his general contribution to the subject, avoiding critical analysis. Both Men and Negrov maintain that Maximus the Greek and Platon (Levshin) are the foundational figures for the early development of biblical studies in Russia.

Negrov's account further corresponds with that of Men by devoting a section to three nineteenth-century figures: Metropolitan Filaret of Moscow, Aleksandr Bukharev and

[253] Мень А.прот. К истории... 322-3, Negrov, Alexander, *Biblical Interpretation in the Russian Orthodox Church* 51-54.
[254] Мень А.прот. К истории... 322.
[255] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том второй. 168.
[256] Negrov, Alexander, *Biblical Interpretation in the Russian Orthodox Church,* 60-65.
[257] Мень А.прот. К истории... 325.

Gerasim Pavskii.[258] It is clear from our discussion above in 1.1.5 that Men's inclusion of Gerasim Pavskii as a significant figure in Russian Orthodox biblical studies is controversial. Bukharev was an equally controversial figure, interested in Alexandrian mysticism, Fichte, Schelling and Hegel, who wrote an extensive historiosophical commentary on the book of Revelation. This work met with strong criticism from conservative figures within the church, and finally led Bukharev to reject his priestly ministry in favour of a secular vocation. Aspects of his interpretive approach led Paul Valliere, in *Modern Russian Thinkers,* to see Bukharev as a forerunner to both Solov′ev and Bulgakov.[259] Men's inclusion of Pavskii and Bukharev alongside the thoroughly uncontroversial Metropolitan Filaret as major Russian Orthodox biblical scholars drew criticism in the only explicit response to his article from a Russian Orthodox commentator. Petukhov admitted these two figures were certainly interesting pioneers, but cautioned that their writings should not be considered central to church tradition in the way that Men (and Negrov) claim, because they have not met with widespread acceptance in the Church.[260]

The centre of the Russian Orthodox biblical tradition is difficult to locate, as even in 1917 it remained a discipline under active construction. Both Men and Negrov discuss in relative detail the various figures of the Russian Orthodox Church who sought to respond to the 'Protestant' critical stances of Western theologians such as Adolf von Harnack. These included Mikhail Luzin, Nikolai Eleonskii, Mitrofan Muretov and Boris Gladkov, but Negrov draws particular attention to Dmitrii Bogdashevskii, devoting a substantial study to his biblical hermeneutics.[261] In doing this, Negrov clearly wishes to locate Bogdashevskii at the centre, regarding him as one of the most characteristic Russian Orthodox exponents of

[258] Negrov, Alexander, *Biblical Interpretation in the Russian Orthodox Church,* 80-87, Мень А.прот. К истории... 334-340.
[259] Valliere, Paul, *Modern Russian Theology*, esp. on Bukharev, 17-106.
[260] Петухов А.свящ. К статье прот. А. Меня.... 19-20: http://lavravcheremushkah.ru/images/articles/public/01-1.pdf, [Accessed 07/07/2018].
[261] Negrov, Alexander, *Biblical Interpretation in the Russian Orthodox Church*, 155-277 (Chapter Five).

biblical interpretation. This is open to debate; perhaps the weakest part of Negrov's study is his somewhat uncritical use of Bogdashevskii to illustrate the essential characteristics of 'Russian Orthodox' biblical interpretation. Although undoubtedly less controversial than the various 'Russian school' figures, Bogdashevskii has not been canonised, and this alone relegates him to a subsidiary role for conservatives (Petukhov, Volgin, Vershillo and Sysoev). Men, for his part, briefly discusses the thought of Bogdashevskii, and gives it a positive assessment.[262] Ultimately, however, Men did not see the school to which Bogdashevskii belonged as central to 'Russian Orthodox' biblical interpretation. He remarked on the 1910 work by another of its representatives Pavel Yungerov *A General Historical-Critical Introduction to the Holy Old Testament Books.*[263] "It was the final, summary attempt to consolidate the position of the old isagogics with the use of substantial scientific apparati. After this, the Russian biblical-historical school rejected these positions and the conflation of isagogic problems with the dogmatic sphere".[264] From the remainder of Men's article, it becomes clear that he believed things had developed beyond the positions espoused by commentators like Bogdashevskii. He considered Boris Turaev and Anton Kartashev to be the leading Russian thinkers on isagogics, Sergei Bulgakov and Nikolai Berdyaev the leading Russian thinkers on hermeneutics, while Sergei Bulgakov, Boris Turaev and Sergei Trubetskoi led the development of historical criticism in Russian biblical thought. Vladimir Solov′ev was a key figure whose somewhat idiosyncratic 'biblical theology' served as an inspiration and foundation for many of these theologians.

Petukhov criticises Men's reliance on these 'Russian school' thinkers, since their teachings are 'alien' to the Church. He is concerned that Men treats them as though they have been

[262] Мень А.прот. К истории... 350.
[263] Юнгеров П. Общее историко-критическое введение в священные Ветхозаветные книги. Казань: Типо-литогр. Имп. Ун-та, 1902.
[264] Мень А.прот. К истории... 351.

canonised. Negrov, in contrast, largely ignores them, with the exception of Sergei Bulgakov, upon whom he draws significantly without explaining how Bulgakov's highly individual (and controversial) thought is related to his generally more conservative characterisation of 'Russian Orthodox' interpretation. Negrov does not overtly criticise Men for his reliance on 'Russian school' thinkers, but at this point, Negrov's departure from Men's narrative speaks for itself. His extensive use of Men's article highlights the importance and pioneering nature of Men's historically-informed developmental account of the hermeneutic practices of the Orthodox Church. That Negrov is not prepared to follow Men further by placing the 'Russian school' thinkers at the centre of his account accentuates Men's originality in wishing to use them as an intellectual and visionary resource for the future trajectory of the Church and its exegetical practices; Men wishes to progress beyond a topographic account of what Orthodoxy is, preferring to give a dynamic account of what it might be.

There is another difference between Men and Negrov worthy of remark, concerned with the value they attribute to early Russian approaches to biblical interpretation. Negrov states this.

> From the very beginning of Russian Christianity until the middle of the eighteenth century, factors such as widespread illiteracy, the preference of the people to express their erudition through painting and music rather than through a literary statement, the deficiency of biblical texts and the lack of a biblical canon as a whole, the absence of stable theological training in the Bible, and political confusions in the nation all prevented the rise and development of biblical scholarship during the early period of the Russian Orthodox Church.[265]

While both emphasise that biblical studies only began in Russia in earnest as an academic discipline from around 1750, Men is keener than Negrov to emphasise the validity of artistic forms of interpretation; his article mentions Andrei Rublev the fourteenth-century iconographer,[266] and his *Dictionary* devotes an article both to Rublev[267] and his contemporary

[265] Negrov, Alexander, *Biblical Interpretation in the Russian Orthodox Church*, 58.
[266] Мень А.прот. К истории... 321.
[267] Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том первый. 65-66.

Theophanes the Greek.[268] Men's *Dictionary* also contains articles on a number of art forms, and other Russian painters who lived before 1750. This is discussed in Chapter Four.

2.1.3) Divine Inspiration, Isagogics and Hermeneutics

Now that we have given a brief historical account of 'Russian Orthodox Biblical Interpretation', we need to discuss some of its specific qualities. For this we are almost entirely reliant on Men's own writings. The following discussion therefore sets out and attempts to analyse three interconnected aspects of his characterisation of 'Russian Orthodox' biblical interpretation by locating his 'Russian school' sources.

2.1.3.1) Divine Inspiration

As Negrov remarks, the Russian-language biblical canon has historically lacked the kind of stability seen in the West.[269] To some extent, a number of interconnected theoretical questions concerned with canonicity, divine inspiration and biblical unity have remained open in the Eastern Church and a discussion of them should precede an assessment of Men's overall views on isagogics and hermeneutics. The first among these concerns the status accorded to the books of the inter-testamental period usually included in Russian-language Bibles (Tobit, Judith, Wisdom of Solomon, Sirach, Letter of Jeremiah, Baruch, 1-3 Maccabees and 2-3 Ezra), equivalent to the 'Deutero-Canonical books' of the Catholic Church or the Protestant 'Old Testament Apocrypha'. Men refers to them as the "Non-Canonical books" of the Old Testament,[270] which is telling. Although he discusses all of these books in *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life, Isagogics* and commentaries on them are included in the Brussels

[268] Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том третий. 309-310.
[269] For example, Negrov, Alexander, *Biblical Interpretation in the Russian Orthodox Church*, 42.
[270] Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том второй. 261-262.

Bible, it is clear they are not allocated the same interpretive weight, and their themes are generally summarised with greater brevity. This is because Men does not consider them to be divinely inspired in the same sense as the canonical books, even if they are edifying. Orthodoxy, unlike Catholicism, we are told in the *Dictionary* article, maintains a two-level approach to divine inspiration in the Old Testament. In *How to Read the Bible,* Men takes things a little further by suggesting[271] that 'divine inspiration' as a term is only to be applied to the canonical books of the Holy Scriptures, suggesting sympathy with a 'Protestant' view that follows the Masoretic texts rather than the Septuagint.

The canonical ambiguity of these books in the Orthodox Church means that for Men their status 'as divinely inspired' also remains ambiguous. This is because any assessment of divine inspiration is primarily dependent on the canonical recognition of the church, as opposed to any historical or literary-critical qualities. Originally a key principle of Khomyakov's approach to biblical interpretation,[272] this appears to have become a foundational principle for the 'Russian school' understanding of canonicity; Bulgakov, for example, connects divine inspiration to the work of the Holy Spirit, which is expressed ecclesially.[273] A practical example in Men's writings is provided by his interpretation of the pericope Mark 16:9-20, which is now rarely seen as an original part of the Gospel. For Men it is authoritative. Since it has been accepted by the Church, it is fully canonical and therefore divinely inspired, regardless of its historical provenance.[274]

The unity of Scripture is not simply, however, a matter of the Church's canonical acceptance of certain texts. Men frequently refers us to the 'biblical theology' developed by certain

[271] 'Dictionary of Terms' (Словарь терминов) in Мень А.прот., Как читать библию. Часть третья. М: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2005. 415.
[272] 'Khomyakov (1804-60)' in Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том третий, 357.
[273] Bulgakov, Sergius, *Unfading Light: Contemplations and Speculations* translated Thomas Allan Smith, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012), 99.
[274] Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том первый. 393.

Russian religious philosophers, with Solov′ev most important among them. Solov′ev's work *The History and Future of Theocracy*[275] gives a synthesis of biblical theology centred on what he calls the 'theocratic ideal'. The foundational theological concept of this synthesis is the "realisation of the divine ideal in the earthly life of humanity".[276] Solov′ev's work begins by defining 'theocracy' against certain misrepresentations of the ideal. In order for it to be truly expressed in the church, the church must be a living, organic entity with the divine-humanity of Christ at its centre. This universalism requires that questions of national character and conservatism in ecclesial practice are left on one side.[277] Solov′ev considers the development of the theocratic ideal through biblical history, first by considering the 'theocracy' of the Patriarchs, then the 'national theocracy' of Moses, then the priestly, royal and prophetic theocratic ideals. In the Old Testament, concepts of 'covenant' play an essential role in its development. The prophetic books are essential insofar as they lead the Israelites to a concept of universal theocracy in the post-exilic period, expressed in Jeremiah's "new covenant".[278] All of these themes are fully unified and expressed by New Testament theocracy, realised in Jesus Christ and his teaching of the Kingdom of God.

This work is of no small significance for Men: it served as the primary inspiration for *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life* and both works include extensive discussion of the nature of the Divine Economy.[279] Men, like Harnack, criticised the work for insufficient attention to isagogic questions,[280] and did not use term 'theocracy',[281] but he drew greatly on Solov′ev's emphases in biblical interpretation, the architecture of his 'biblical theology' and

[275] Соловьев. В.С. Исторія и будущность теократіи – Собрание сочинений. 2-е изд. Том четверый. Спб.: Книгоиздательское Товарищество "Просвѣщеніе", 1912. 243-642.
[276] Мень А.прот. К истории... 372.
[277] Соловьев. В.С. Исторія и будущность теократіи. 334-336.
[278] Jeremiah 31:31-34, cited by Solov′ev, Соловьев. В.С. Исторія и будущность теократіи. 564.
[279] Еремин. А.А. Отец Александр Мень... 444.
[280] Мень А.прот. К истории... 372.
[281] Men replies "the idea of earthly theocracy" to the question "Which ideas of the system of Vladimir Solov′ev are alien to you and why?": 'About Time and Myself' (О времени и о себе), in Бычков С. С. Хроника нераскрытого убийства. М.: Русское рекламное издательство, 1996, 172: http://imwerden.de/pdf/bychkov_khronika_neraskrytogo_ubijstva_1996_text.pdf [Accessed 22/04/2018].

particularly attended to Solov′ev's use of the notion of 'divine-humanity' in his own explanations of divine inspiration.[282] In Men's work, the role of the 'theocratic ideal' with its political connotations, is replaced by something more organic. He follows Bulgakov's ideas concerning the cultural nature of Eden and the millennial kingdom, and his 'biblical theology' appears directed more towards something like a divine-human culture than a theocracy (2.2.2, 3.6.1-2). Nonetheless, Men presented his understanding of the unity of the Bible through the prism of a Solov′evian biblical theology in his article *World of the Bible*.[283]

> With a careful reading it is possible to sense that the Bible has a certain inherent unity, which is reached not architectonically, but by another path. The whole variegated conglomerate of biblical poetry and prose is transfused by subtle, but extremely strong threads, turning a collection of books into one complete Book. Pervasive themes carry out the role of these connecting threads in a frame that is not immediately comprehensible, and these [themes] persistently repeat from time to time in the most varied of contexts.[284]

One of these is the idea of 'covenant', central to both Solov′ev and Men,[285] as demonstrated by the centrality of Jeremiah 31:31-34 for both; the symbol of the desert as the kingdom of death forms another (Exodus, Matthew 4, Revelation 12:14). For Men the 'Kingdom of God' is an important unifying theme. The 'linear' conception of history inspired by the concept of the 'Kingdom' is almost unique to Old Testament religion in the ancient world (the only other example is to be found in Zoroastrianism[286]), but on its own, this is insufficient to establish a notion of divine inspiration. This may only be done when all the disparate connecting themes combine to create the divine-human entity that Men calls the 'Biblical world' (*bibleiskii mir*). In *Isagogics* Men claims, "In a similar way to the service and ikon, the Bible is a whole world of ideas and forms, a complete organism, absorbing in itself a multiplicity of traditions" (Chapter Four).[287] The unity of the Bible is a complex divine-human continuity:

[282] 'Solov′ev (1853-1900)' in Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том третий. 138-143.
[283] Мень А.прот., Как читать библию. Часть первая. 17-46.
[284] Мень А.прот., Как читать библию. Часть первая. 26.
[285] Соловьев В.С. Чтения о Богочеловечестве – Собрание сочинений. Том третий, 70-78.
[286] Мень А.прот. Вестники... 356-82.
[287] Мень А.прот. Исагогика, 42.

eternity is expressed through the variegated consciousnesses and creative expressions of individual humans living in a continuous spiritual tradition centred on the Person of Christ (the God-Man). This is the quality that expresses the divine inspiration of the text.

Scripture is distinct from an ordinary literary work in the spiritual practice of believers, because it is an 'ikon' that requires spiritual work if the reader wishes to find its centre. In this centre we find both the "biblical 'cosmos'"[288] and the Person of Christ. The Old Testament should be interpreted not just as 'text'; the biblical world that is the content of the divinely-inspired unity of Scripture goes beyond the mere summation of connecting themes. This is because it is given unity by Christ as its 'Alpha and Omega'. The 'Biblical world' of the Bible has a christological gravitational centre. Separate parts of the text should not be taken in isolation, but revelation should be seen as a whole by supplementing one text with another.[289] Both Solov′ev and Men see divine-humanity as a key interpretive principle, but a personalist christocentrism distinguishes Men's view of biblical unity, because he places greater emphasis on the qualitative distinction between Christ, whom the believer may 'encounter' (*vstretit′*) personally, and other biblical figures. If Solov′ev is content to include Christ's 'theocracy' as an additional chapter in the same work and retain the logic of Hegelian christology, for Men the Person of Christ is qualitatively different to such an extent that He must be considered in a wholly separate work, thus accentuating the fact that he can only be seen through genuine new revelation, not as the logical resolution of biblical searching.[290] *Son of Man* is therefore to be distinguished from *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life* on a theological level.[291]

[288] Мень А.прот. Как читать библию. Часть первая, 27.
[289] Мень А.прот. Как читать библию. Часть первая, 31.
[290] Men sees parallels between his views and those of Karl Barth: 'Barth (1886-1968)': Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том первый. 112-114. Both reject what they consider to be the 'rationalism' of the nineteenth century by emphasising the need for God Himself to speak in Christ.
[291] That *Son of Man* has at times been seen as the seventh volume of *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life*, such as in the 1991-2 publication by Слово in Moscow, is not consistent with Men's intentions. Lukasevicius, Arturas, *Aleksandr Men''s Approach to the World's Religions*, 43 and Масленикова З.А.

2.1.3.2) Isagogics

Men's views on biblical unity and divine inspiration are theological aspects of his approach to 'isagogics', a term, which according to his *Dictionary* article, refers to "the traditional name of the system of biblical disciplines that methodologically precede exegesis".[292] Alongside questions of canon and divine inspiration, the subject also includes hermeneutics and the history of biblical translation, with all forms of biblical criticism, and archaeological studies upon which critics base their conclusions. Men's book *Isagogics* gives a narrower definition; it equates isagogics with biblical-critical positions.[293] It is this kind of isagogics that we now turn to.

Men is keen to contrast pre-nineteenth century isagogics ('old isagogics') with what he calls the 'new isagogics', which is based on the results of critical biblical studies.[294] 'Old isagogics' includes the traditional reflections of Sirach, the Talmud and Church Fathers; it maintains the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, the historical reliability of the Genesis accounts, the unity of Isaian authorship, and Paul's authorship of the Letter to the Hebrews. Conservatives of the Russian Orthodox establishment, such as Volgin and Bufeev, have remained true to this approach. In contrast, 'new isagogics' has led to revisions that Men, following Kartashev, lists in eight points:[295] 1) the Pentateuch was written not by Moses himself, but using traditions concerning Moses, and its origins are given acceptable

Жизнь отца Александра Меня. 254.

[292] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый. 561.

[293] Мень А.прот. Исагогика. 25, 588.

[294] Compare 'Old Isagogics' (Старая исагогика), in Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том третий. 174-5, with 'New Isagogics' (Новая исагогика), in Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том второй. 286-7.

[295] Мень А.прот. Исагогика. 63-64. These eight points were presented by Kartashev in a speech in Paris in February 1944: Карташев А.прот. Ветхозаветная библейская критика.

explanation by the Documentary Hypothesis;[296] 2) The Deuteronomic History was written in the exilic period on the basis of ancient tradition, whereas Chronicles was written around 300BCE;[297] 3) David did not write all the Psalms attributed to him;[298] 4) At least in their final forms, Job, Ecclesiastes and Psalms were written in the Second Temple period;[299] 5) The prophet Isaiah, son of Amoz did not write all of the book attributed to him, but the so-called Deutero-Isaiah dates from the exilic period, and Trito-Isaiah from the post-exilic period;[300] 6) the first part of the book of Zechariah was written in the sixth century, before being expanded by a second writer in the fourth;[301] 7) Daniel was written in c.165BCE at the time of the Maccabaean revolt, partly following older tradition[302] and 8) Paul did not write the Letter to the Hebrews, but it was written by a group of disciples close to him.[303]

These points are hardly progressive by contemporary standards in the West: Liberal Protestants accepted this 'new isagogics' in the second half of the nineteenth century and Catholics in the middle of the twentieth century, while the modern discipline of biblical studies would further question not only some of the dates, but value more detailed critical assessment of how the texts were assembled over time. The Russian Orthodox have held conflicted views since the nineteenth century, and despite Men's best attempts to set Kartashev's views at the basis of Orthodox biblical studies, views remain conflicted.[304] Men,

[296] Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие... 477-489. Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том второй. 528. See Brussels Bible commentary.
[297] Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие... 490-494. Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый. 585. See Brussels Bible commentary.
[298] Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие... 495-499. Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том второй. 516. See Brussels Bible commentary.
[299] Мень А.прот. Исагогика. 465-87. See Brussels Bible commentary.
[300] Мень А.прот. Вестники... 452-463. Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый. 563. See Brussels Bible commentary.
[301] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый. 455. See Brussels Bible commentary.
[302] Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета: От эпохи Александра Македонского до проповеди Иоанна Крестителя. Книга I. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011. 307-322. Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый. 310. Мень А.прот. Исагогика. 518-30. See Brussels Bible commentary.
[303] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том второй. 286-287. Мень А.прот. Исагогика. 63-64. See Brussels Bible commentary.
[304] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том второй. 33. Valliere lists Anton Kartashev as a representative of the Russian School: Valliere, Paul, *Modern Russian Theology,* 2.

acknowledging the further development of biblical studies in the West after Kartashev's speech, cites the statement of the latter. "The discoveries made by biblical science have so confirmed the critical position, that argument about its conclusions has now moved over into the sphere of individual details; with respect to the former pre-critical approach to the Bible, such an approach is already unthinkable".[305] Men's most significant works have, however, failed to create a consensus in favour of the 'new isagogics' in the Russian Orthodox Church. *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life, Isagogics*, *How to Read the Bible*, and *Dictionary* remain controversial precisely because they are attempts at realising and disseminating the isagogical principles of Kartashev and the other 'Russian school' figures.

2.1.3.3) Hermeneutics

Men was not unaware of the opposition to his 'new isagogics' and sought to defend it against conservatives first by disentangling the question of divine inspiration from that of authorship (as done by Bulgakov, Turaev, Kartashev, Knyazev and others) and second by claiming, against the conservatives, that 'old isagogics' does not belong to the tradition (*predanie*) of the Church. Disentangling divine inspiration from other isagogical questions such as authorship, date, and historical context, introduces problems when establishing the rules of exegesis and creating a hermeneutical method.[306] Approaching Scripture as the Word of God and using it for teaching in faith and life is something qualitatively distinct from approaching it critically.[307] Yet Men views the second, critical, approach as an essential prerequisite for the first, and therefore hermeneutics should find a way of relating both.[308] Men cites Knyazev, who tells us the critical method "is the most natural and correct approach, of course,

[305] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том второй. 287. See Карташев А.прот. Православие в его отношениях к историческому процессу. - Православный мысль, 1948, № 6, 140: http://www.golubinski.ru/ecclesia/kartashev/pravoslavie.htm [Accessed 25/07/2018].
[306] Мень А.прот. Исагогика. 43.
[307] Мень А.прот. Исагогика. 43(1).
[308] Мень А.прот. Исагогика. 43(5).

depending on the condition that it is led by faith in Revelation",[309] but the problem remains. How can we avoid the exegetical process predetermining the results of the critical process on the one hand, or the exegete's disconnection from critical results on the other?

When considering Men's views on hermeneutics, we may discuss two different aspects. First we may consider Men's views on how Scripture should be used in pastoral ministry in order to determine the factors he believed should be taken into account when the ordinary believer interprets biblical passages. We find these factors listed in the text known in English as *Credo* under the heading *II: The Bible and Its Interpretation*.[310] The most significant are as follows. (1) The faith that should lead us in our reading of the Bible is christocentric: it is "total trust in God as revealed in Christ". We accept that 'the Word of God' is "recorded in Scripture", but avoid "giving a literal interpretation to the Bible, especially of the Old Testament" (1.1.5 on the applicability of demythologisation to the Old and New Testaments).[311] (2) "One and the same God revealed himself in both Testaments; but… God revealed himself gradually as befitted the level of human consciousness."[312] This point is related to the Solov′evian dynamic biblical theology that Men develops in *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life.* The Bible is not merely a static representation of ossified truth, but a living entity. Therefore (3) we should desist from finding "in Scripture or the writings of the Church Fathers statements about natural science held to be valid for all time." Men, in opposition to the kind of view held by Volgin, denies recourse to these texts as a static repository of interpretive information. As a result, for example, we cannot assert that the Genesis accounts are historically accurate on the basis that one of the Fathers held them to be so. The use of a critical framework is a methodological requirement for interpreting all religious texts, not just

[309] Мень А.прот. Исагогика. 46.
[310] *Christianity for the Twenty-First Century*, 68-74. It should be noted that this heading and the division into sections is not present in Men's original text.
[311] Men uses Romans 7:6 to support this principle.
[312] Men uses Hebrews 1:1-2.

Scripture. Thus Men claims (4) that we should view "the academic study of the Bible and church history as an important means for clarifying the meaning of revelation and establishing the actual circumstances of sacred history". In Men's 'religious histories' such as *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life* and *Son of Man,* he clearly attempts to disseminate the results of this academic study in such a way that they be made accessible to his parishioners and helpful devotionally. Engaging with such material helps believers to distinguish Tradition as expressed in Scripture and writings of the Fathers from folkloric and "impermanent accretions" often called "traditions".[313]

Men's hermeneutics valued academic study of the text, engagement with historical criticism, and a dynamic view of traditional interpretations. While avoiding literalism, Men sought to emphasise that the Bible is the Word of God, although it is also a divine-human Word, and believed that all interpretation should be led by a total trust in the God revealed in Jesus Christ. He preferred a dynamic engagement with biblical history to the 'easy option' of using static symbolic/allegorical interpretation. The principles for Bible study outlined in Credo may be seen in action in Men's 'religious histories'.

A second aspect of Men's hermeneutics is shown in his *Dictionary* articles on the subject. There, the discussion is more theoretical and less directly concerned with pastoral and apologetic application. Hermeneutics, as the establishment of exegetical rules and methods,[314] is a discipline that may be applied not only to the Bible, and indeed, Men acknowledges that hermeneutical methods were present in antiquity: Greek philosophers (especially Stoics) used the 'allegorical method' to find the 'inner' meaning of Homer's myths. In this form of interpretation, myths were used freely, often to set out the philosopher's own views rather

[313] *Christianity for the Twenty-First Century*, 69-70.
[314] Мень А.прот. Исагогика. 43. Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый. 249. Мень А.прот. К истории... 357.

than specifically to explicate a text. This did mean, however, that myths were defended from 'blasphemous' use. The Jewish philosopher Philo of Alexandria (c.25BCE-c.50CE) approached Old Testament texts in this way.[315] Men, however, was keen to avoid disconnecting historical analysis from exegesis.

The Fathers come closer to the mark in their development of these ancient practices, creating what Men calls 'old hermeneutics'. In distinguishing between 'old hermeneutics', based on Patristic methods, and 'new hermeneutics', Men tells us that the methods of 'old hermeneutics' remain in full force.[316] Men describes these methods as intrinsically polysemantic insofar as they distinguish between 'literal' interpretation and 'hidden' meaning: the 'literal' interpretation may be historical or metaphorical, whereas the text's 'hidden' significance may be typological, ethical or anagogical.[317] Accommodative hermeneutics can be appended to this patristic framework for homiletic purposes.[318] Alongside Men's 'religious histories', which take a historical approach to biblical interpretation, the various published collections of Men's sermons take a straightforward accommodative approach to biblical interpretation, showing typological, ethical and anagogical qualities.[319] These bear a closer resemblance to Patristic homiletical style.

Men viewed 'new hermeneutics',[320] which developed in the course of the twentieth century, with some cynicism. In his *Dictionary* article *New Hermeneutics*, a brief discussion of the

[315] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый, 251, Том третий, 327. A detailed discussion of Philo that would have been familiar to Men is Sergei Trubetskoi's *Teaching of the Logos in its History,* Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о логосе в его истории – Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994, 43-482: 117-203. For a more recent analysis, see Borgen, Peder, *Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete for his time,* (Leiden: Brill, 2005).

[316] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том третий, 174.

[317] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый, 59.

[318] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый, 40.

[319] A detailed analysis of this point would take us far beyond the scope of this study. Men's sermons seem more theologically 'conservative' and are of less significance in a study of Men's contribution to Orthodox Biblical Studies. Examples of these approaches to biblical interpretation may be found in his various published sermon collections, such as Мень А.прот. О вечном и временном. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2007. This includes a series of sermons on evangelical themes.

[320] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том второй. 284-86.

thought of Heidegger, Gadamer and Ricoeur suggests that Men believed they added little to the work of Barth and Bultmann, although they developed their ideas with greater attention to linguistic and structural analysis. Men does not appear to have engaged with what he calls 'new hermeneutics' in any detail, although he does give a positive assessment of Ricoeur's 'pre-understanding' on the basis that it illustrates Knyazev's principle (hermeneutics should be led by faith in revelation). Men summarises, "for the interpretation of the Word of God, faith is required, which in turn helps apprehend its meaning". The other proponents of 'new hermeneutics', despite trying to make the Scriptures comprehensible 'today', have neither avoided "an ingrained subjectivism that recalls the arbitrariness of allegorical methods of exegesis" nor the "inheritance of liberal theology", with its substantial denigration of the Old Testament (Volgin argues that Men is also guilty of this in the first part of *Protopresbyter Aleksandr Men as a Commentator on the Holy Scriptures*). Such "extra-historical interpretations" dissolve the content of the Word of God into amorphous existential states. Men's views on 'new hermeneutics' scarcely consider the many nuances of the principal texts of this movement.[321] It is clear that Men never took the time to study Heidegger and Gadamer in any detail, which is a pity. Heidegger's rapprochement with ontology was not altogether dissimilar from Sergei Trubetskoi's reworking of metaphysics into 'concrete idealism',[322] which was a philosophical ideology Men knew well and respected (Chapter Three). Gadamer's interest in the hermeneutical implications of the ontology of art in *Truth and Method*[323] also finds parallels with Men's interest in portraying biblical texts through art (Chapter Four).

[321] Far more sympathetic introductions to the hermeneutical methods of Gadamer and Ricoeur may be found in Thiselton, Anthony, *Hermeneutics*, *An Introduction*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009) and Louth, Andrew, *Discerning the Mystery: An Essay on the Nature of Theology,* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983).

[322] Gaidenko makes this clear: Гайденко П.П. <Конкретный идеализм> С.Н. Трубецкого. - Трубецкой С.Н. Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 3-42, 31.

[323] Gadamer, Hans-Georg, *Truth and Method* Second, Revised Edition (London: Continuum, 2004), esp. Part I.

2.1.4) Summary

In his article *Concerning the History of Russian Orthodox Biblical Studies*, Men gives a narrative for how 'Russian Orthodox biblical studies' is to be perceived. The account opposes the 'static' principles of Volgin and even Predein. Indeed, Men was a pioneer, insofar as he was perhaps the first commentator to give an account of the historical development of interpretive practices in the Russian Orthodox Church. He was not satisfied by giving only a list of 'rules' (which he certainly did, see 2.2) for conducting exegesis, since, as he realised, these rules have not been completely consistent. Men's accounts of divine inspiration, isagogics and hermeneutics start to provide us with a dynamic 'Russian school' inflected picture of Russian Orthodox Biblical Interpretation. Men was both original and controversial in his appeal to the philosophical thought of the 'Russian school', both in his history as representatives of Russian Orthodox thought and as a theoretical basis for how divine inspiration, biblical unity, isagogics and hermeneutics are to be understood. Yet this should not be disregarded off-hand as inconsistent with 'Russian Orthodox biblical interpretation'. It seems to fit well with the inclusive nature of Byzantine exegetical practices noted at the beginning of this chapter. Men's biblical theology, however, provides a way of understanding both the unity and divine inspiration of Scripture. In other words, it lies at the basis of his interpretive procedures. Furthermore, Men's historical positions cannot be easily separated from some of the theological positions he takes, which becomes clear in his expositions of the Creation narrative and the events of the life of Moses in *Magic Art and Monotheism.* For these reasons interpretive and doctrinal matters cannot be neatly compartmentalised in his work: Men could therefore plausibly be portrayed as a thinker who disguised his suspicious dogmatic presuppositions as pure exegesis.

Nonetheless, his principal opponents have struggled to give an alternative characterisation of the principles and development of 'Russian Orthodox biblical interpretation', which they could use as a starting point for a genuine criticism of Men. Their own 'literalist' interpretations tend to rely on an arbitrary and uncritical appreciation and objectivisation of individual Patristic texts, while it is debatable whether such approaches are any less reliant on certain Western hermeneutical principles. Negrov's account of 'Russian Orthodox biblical interpretation' is considerably more nuanced than that of Volgin or Predein, but it is debatable that Dmitrii Bogdashevkii should be seen as normative for Orthodox exegetical practices in the way he claims. Men, by contrast, sees such 'Russian school' figures as Vladimir Solov′ev, Sergei Trubetskoi, Sergei Bulgakov, Anton Kartashev and Boris Sové as absolutely central and critical for the ongoing development of interpretative practices within the Orthodox Church. His understanding of biblical unity draws heavily on Solov′ev, while his application of the 'new isagogics' draws heavily on Kartashev. Men, when engaging in polemic, drew on Patristic sources to which both he and his opponents attributed authority, although he believed that Patristic texts should be subjected to just the same kind of critical analysis as Scriptural texts.

2.2) Aleksandr Men's Four Principles for Russian Orthodox Biblical Interpretation

In the first section of his article *Concerning the History of Russian Orthodox Biblical Studies*, Men presents four principles used in 'Orthodox' biblical interpretation. Dating from 1987, this article also postdates all five of Men's most important works (1.2.3), and could therefore be taken as an authoritative summary of his approach to biblical interpretation, even though ostensibly this is an attempt to describe general principles that have historically characterised

the approach of Orthodox exegetes, following in the path of such eminent Orthodox luminaries as Metropolitan Platon (Levshin) (2.1.2). Further analysis in the light of Men's major works suggests that the way these principles are applied shows a development of earlier Russian approaches on the basis of 'Russian school' sources. The principles are set out in the way they are to show continuity with historic Russian Orthodox approaches to biblical interpretation, but, as with his principles of divine inspiration, biblical unity, isagogics, and hermeneutics, the way they are applied by Men obscures the boundary between biblical interpretation, and the biblical theology based on it, which is decidedly 'Russian school' in its atmosphere. Indeed, an analysis of these principles will begin to illuminate the interrelations of interpretation and 'Russian school' theology in Men's writings, so they are worthy of an extended discussion in a new section, even though in essence this discussion merely continues the attempts of the previous section to understand what 'Russian Orthodox Biblical Interpretation' actually is.

2.2.1) The Patristic Principle

The first and most important of these principles came to be orientation on the Patristic heritage.[324] Following the Fathers of the Church, Russian Orthodox exegetes have considered interpretation of the Bible to be a "work of faith", perceiving the words of God. The holy Patriarch Pimen had precisely this in mind, when he called us to explicate Scripture "in the spirit of Patristic interpretation".[325]

This principle, as expressed by Men, has been most significant in maintaining the dogmatic emphasis of Russian biblical studies against critical 'contamination'.

This Patristic heritage may itself be approached in one of two different ways. Some commentators have treated it as a formal framework that turned interpretation into

[324] This is Platon (Levshin)'s Ninth Rule: Negrov, Alexander, *Biblical Interpretation in the Russian Orthodox Church*, 62.
[325] Мень А.прот. К истории... 310.

'anthologies of Patristic texts'.[326] Men relates this to the biblical literalism described by Sové as Monophysitism; the approach has been imported from Protestant fundamentalism. An example of this may be found in the writings of Men's critic Vladimir Volgin (2.1.1), who explains the role of the Fathers in interpretation in relation to the divine inspiration of the Bible itself.

> The principle of divine inspiration means that for any studies of the Bible, the human factor should be subjugated to the divine. In Orthodoxy there exists a certain discipline of the mind, a culture of thinking in understanding the Bible. Its main law is that the Holy Scriptures may only be interpreted in correspondence with the Holy Tradition of the Church, in accordance with the thought of the Holy Fathers.... And this is not just some kind of 'narrow-mindedness' or 'despotism' of thought, or the demand of jealous obscurantism. It is the natural consequence of the principle of the divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. The Holy Spirit composed the Holy Scriptures through the prophets and the apostles. The Holy Spirit interpreted them through the Holy Fathers. Any biblical studies that do not have the recognition of the Church are therefore without foundation. They, so to speak, are deprived of the witness of the Bible's author, the Holy Spirit, which is present in the Church.[327]

If the Holy Spirit composed Scripture through the prophets and apostles, then He interpreted it through the Fathers. Thus Patristic interpretation is isomorphically related to the teaching of the Church. The Church has at its disposal a rigid body of material that may be applied for interpretive requirements in all circumstances; for correct use, "a discipline of mind" is required, not critical analysis. Volgin appeals to the Nineteenth Canon of the Quinisext Council to support his views, but his interpretation of this Canon is not completely irrefutable.[328] The instruction contained there that preachers should not deviate from the teaching of the Fathers does not intend that preachers must construct their sermons as a catena of Patristic sayings and nothing more. Men did not wish to 'deviate' from the teachings of the Fathers, but he did wish to emphasise the humanity not only of the biblical

[326] Мень А.прот. К истории... 311.

[327] Антиминсов С. прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как комментатор священного писания, 5.

[328] "...if the discourse be one concerning a passage of Scripture, not to interpret it otherwise than as the luminaries and teachers of the Church in their own written works have presented it; and let them rather content themselves with these discourses than attempt to produce discourses of their own, lest, at times, being resourceless, they overstep the bounds of propriety...." https://www.prophet-elias.com/deutsch/in-english/in-english-1/ [Accessed 24/06/2018].

writers, but of the Fathers who interpreted what they wrote.

This approach is modelled by a second group of commentators who looked to the Fathers as models for the further development of biblical science, a development that included understanding how to involve the secular disciplines of modernity. Those who took this approach did not follow the literal word, but the spirit of the Patristic tradition, and so believed it perfectly acceptable, taking the lead of the Fathers, to engage with literature, historiography, philosophy and philology when conducting exegesis. Men concludes his discussion of the Patristic principle with the following controversial statement. "The example of the Fathers of the Church revealed for Russian biblical scholars the possibility and necessity of creatively assimilating the most recent procedures of investigation, hermeneutics, and the results of historical research".[329]

Many Fathers, such as Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa and John Chrysostom were highly educated by the secular standards of their day and brought their learnings to bear in their commentaries on Scripture. "The Fathers themselves undertook an enormous work with respect to the isagogics of Scripture, confirming the genuine text, comparing translations, resolving problems of authorship of the holy books, while at the same time these books had already been long recognised as canonical".[330] The Ante-Nicene Fathers were particularly adventurous. Despite the verbalism of Justin Martyr, the Apologetes used the Old Testament creatively and the New Testament in variant texts, and often preferred not to cite Scripture directly, but to paraphrase it. Origen engaged extensively in textual criticism, and Dionysius the Great questioned the common authorship of John's Gospel and the Book of Revelation. For Men, the sensible response in the face of these varied exegetical

[329] Мень А.прот. К истории... 312.
[330] Мень А.прот. Два письма Владимиру Волгину: Second Letter, Part 2.

models was not to copy individual Patristic isagogic positions in the manner advocated by Volgin, but draw on the hermeneutical principles of the Fathers and in that way continue their spiritual legacy.

The distinction between these two approaches is especially evident in Men's *Dictionary* discussion of Orthodox theologian Mikhail Tareev's approach to the Fathers.[331] Tareev, like Men, was suspicious of metaphysics and dogmatic theology, since he believed that a philosophy of life should be based in genuine religious experience. This led him to deny the existence of a critical Patristic framework for both dogma and exegesis and fully adopt the kind of approach later advocated by Men. Men tells us,

> he frequently based his arguments on the Fathers of the Church, but held that "there is no unified Patristic teaching, instead there are Patristic systems and viewpoints, which may be chosen arbitrarily by a theologian". Tareev believed that all too often "The Patristic principle hides the excessive arbitrariness of interpreters".

If we compare this with Volgin (Antiminsov's) appeals to the 'Patristic' principle, then we see that Volgin has adopted precisely the approach Tareev criticised.

Men does not ignore Tareev simply because he has not been canonised, but agrees that in approaching the Fathers, exegetes and theologians should think carefully not only about the identity of a theologian, but about their methodology. Volgin is, however, far from unique in his lack of interest in methodology and rigid appeal to 'the Fathers'. Konstantin Bufeev, for example, refers to 'Patristic theology' in a similarly uncritical way when he discusses Men's interpretation of the Genesis creation narrative and the influence of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin.[332] It seems unlikely that either Men or Teilhard would have agreed with his

[331] 'Tareev (1867-1934)' in Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том третий, 208.
[332] Буфеев, К. Об эволюционнистском богословии Тейара де Шардена и протоиерея Александра Меня.

assessment that their theology is 'alien' to the theologians of the Patristic era.

It is important to recognise that for Russian Orthodox writers, even of a very conservative disposition, authoritative interpretations of Scripture did not end with the Patristic period, but continued with the saints of the Russian Orthodox Church. Men's appreciation of these figures has been called into question. Aleksandr Zanemonets, for example, not only sees Men's criticism of certain Fathers and aspects of Church tradition as unsympathetic and misplaced,[333] but criticises him for preferring Western writers to the 'Fathers' of the Russian Church, such as the nineteenth-century Theophan the Recluse. Although this may to some extent be explained by Men's attempts at apologetics in a Soviet context, it is also related to an 'ecclesiological choice' made, claims Zanemonets. Thus Men's status as an 'Orthodox' writer must remain somewhat questionable. It is perfectly possible to appeal to a Catholic 'Patristic principle', for example, and an Orthodox should guard against this.

Zanemonets' criticisms are of questionable value, however. They are heavily dependent on the recollections of Men's followers and Men's spoken words in determining Men's interpretive priorities. A perusal of the footnotes and bibliographies of Men's written 'religious histories' shows that Russian authors are not neglected, even if some of his most important sources are the 'Russian school' authors and representatives of contemporary Western academic discourse. That he is open to using Western sources is hardly surprising considering the lack of interesting developments in Russian Biblical Studies during the Soviet period, but despite this, his *Dictionary* includes far more articles on Russian Orthodox theologians than either their Catholic or Protestant counterparts.

[333] Apparently, Isaac the Syrian's views on monasticism are subjected to unfair criticism by Men: Занемонец А.диак. Проблема наследия отца Александра Меня в современном русском Православии (2010) at http://www.bogoslov.ru/text/1083016.html [Accessed 26/07/1983]. This page includes the article by Antiminsov in full in the 'commentaries' section.

Zanemonets is, nonetheless, broadly right insofar as he realises Men had a very personal view of how the Fathers should be used and interpreted, determined by certain methodological concerns (for example, apologetics and inclusivity). In his 'religious histories' Men is just as likely to cite Latin Fathers, for example, Augustine (354-430),[334] Ambrose of Milan (334/40-397)[335] and Gregory the Great (540-604),[336] or 'heretics', such as Origen or Theodore of Mopsuestia, as he is to cite respected Greek Fathers such as Athanasius or the Cappadocians. Pride of place is, somewhat unusually for a twentieth-century Russian Orthodox author, taken by Ante-Nicene Fathers, especially the 'apologetes' and Origen. As he writes in *Early Fathers of the Church,*[337] "the reader of the works of the apologetes becomes a participant in an ongoing, even in our days, dialogue between faith and unfaith and gains new strength by falling upon a fresh source of inspiration". Eremin remarks that Justin Martyr (100-165) was especially significant for Men, despite the apologete's tendency towards verbalism. Men was particularly drawn to his universalism and opinion that the Logos, although only fully revealed in Christ, had worked both in the Old Testament prophets and pagan philosophers.[338] Justin was an inspiration for Men in his own attempts at apologetics.

From this Ante-Nicene period, Men devoted substantial *Dictionary* articles not only to Justin,[339] but also to Dionysius the Great (190-265),[340] Hippolytus of Rome (170-236),[341] Irenaeus of Lyons (130-200)[342] and Clement of Alexandria (150-215).[343] His article on Marcion is, as might be expected, highly critical, although it does recognise his contribution

[334] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый, 26-29.
[335] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый, 50-52.
[336] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый, 288-290..
[337] Антология: Ранние отцы Церкви. Брюссуль: Жизнь с Богом, 1988, 256. The authorship of this work is not wholly clear, but Eremin claims it for Men: Еремин. А.А. Отец Александр Мень.... 330.
[338] Еремин. А.А. Отец Александр Мень.... 331.
[339] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый, 601-603.
[340] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый, 354-356.
[341] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый, 554-556.
[342] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый, 557-559.
[343] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том второй, 63-65.

towards the establishment of the New Testament Canon.[344] More surprisingly, the substantial article on Origen,[345] the longest on any figure from the Patristic period, is highly sympathetic and considers in detail his work on textology, the biblical canon, hermeneutics and exegesis. Although Men criticised Origen's allegorical interpretation as a form of demythologisation that usurped the divine-human dialogue in concrete history, he also recognised Origen's attempts to create a unified 'biblical theology' as foundational for later Patristic biblical interpretation. Men, quite unusually for an Orthodox thinker,[346] distanced Origen from 'Origenism' and defended him against attacks on views "he never had".[347]

Less surprisingly, Men also devoted substantial articles to the various fourth and fifth-century figures more commonly cited by 'Orthodox' authors: Basil of Caesarea (c.329-379),[348] Gregory of Nazianzus (330-390),[349] Gregory of Nyssa (c.335-c.394),[350] Eusebius of Caesarea (c.265-c.340),[351] Ephraim the Syrian (c.306-373),[352] Jerome (c.342-420),[353] John Chrysostom (347-407),[354] Cyril of Alexandria (c.377-444)[355] and Theodoret of Cyrrhus (c.393-466)[356] as well as key seventh-century figure Maximus the Confessor (c.580-662).[357] Unusually, however, Men also gave a sympathetic assessment of the idiosyncrasies of Theodore of Mopsuestia (c.350-428),[358] a theologian condemned alongside Origen at the Fifth Ecumenical

344 Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том второй, 178-180.
345 Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том второй, 307-311.
346 His account of Origen's thought contrasts with the unsympathetic account of Vladimir Lossky: Lossky, Vladimir, *Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church,* (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co, 1957), 23-43 (Chapter Two), also with the more measured, but still unsympathetic account of Sergei Bulgakov that identifies Origen with 'Origenist' thinking in *Unfading Light,* esp. 254,303,314.
347 Men defended Origen against the allegation he believed in reincarnation in *At the Gates of Silence:* Мень А.прот. У врат молчания: Духовная жизнь Китая и Индии в середине первого тысячелетия до нашей эры. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, 253.
348 Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый, 188-190.
349 Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый, 291-293.
350 Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый, 294-296.
351 Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый, 413-416.
352 Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый, 435-438.
353 Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый, 485-489.
354 Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый, 531-535.
355 Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том второй, 54-57.
356 Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том третий. 302-304.
357 Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том второй, 170-171.
358 Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том третий. 302-304.

Council. Men defended his 'biblical' views against accusations of proto-rationalism.

When considering Men's own use of the 'Patristic principle', three points should be accepted. First, Men knew the 'biblical' works of the 'Fathers' well, including those of well respected figures such as the Cappadocians, Cyril of Alexandria and Maximus the Confessor, and was quite capable of citing them when he saw fit.[359] Second, although he knew the works of well-respected Fathers, he placed a particular emphasis on the dynamism and creativity of the ante-Nicene period, taking these Fathers as a benchmark for how the Bible should be approached in his own strongly secular context. Third, Men was not concerned to only cite those Patristic authors considered 'saints' in the Orthodox Church. Thus he considered Origen and Theodore of Mopsuestia just as authoritative as some of the better known fourth-century saints in exegetical matters, due to what he saw as their undeniable significance for the development of the Church's interpretive practices and the views of other canonically acceptable Patristic figures.[360] This view is, of course, unacceptable for conservative Orthodox commentators such as Volgin, Petukhov and Zanemonets. It is best seen, however, not as a contradiction of the 'Patristic principle' as defined by the Quinisext Council, but a different, more dynamic, interpretation of that same principle, in keeping with the traditional exegetical inclusivity of the Eastern Churches mentioned at the beginning of the Chapter.

2.2.2) The Divine-human Principle

[359] This is noticeable not only in his 'religious histories', but in his commentaries for the *Brussels Bible* and *Isagogics*.

[360] Origen's significance is well-known and requires no explanation, but Theodore, intriguingly, was an authority for the critical sixteenth-century figure Maximus the Greek, who developed the first Russian exegetical principles: Negrov, Alexander, *Biblical Interpretation in the Russian Orthodox Church*, 53, Горский А. Максим грек Святогорец at https://azbyka.ru/otechnik/Aleksandr_Gorskij/maksim-grek-svjatogorets/ [Accessed 20/09/2018]. Gorskii speaks of Maximus the Greek's biblical exegesis in the following terms: "In his composite exegesis the explanations of thirteen or fourteen different exegetes were brought together, which differed between one another not only with respect to the direction of the exegesis, but in the explanations of different Psalms. Not only this, but among the exegetes were several figures recognised by the ancient Church as heretics; others were seen by Orthodoxy as at least dubious. Not in the Sixteenth Century, but at another time, it might seem strange to the Orthodox reader to see alongside Basil the Great and John Chrysostom the names of Origen, Apollinarius and Theodore of Mopsuestia."

Men uses the Russian christological term 'divine-humanity' to describe his second principle. As we have seen above when discussing the conflict with Volgin, for Men Scripture is not simply the 'Word of God', but a divine-human Word and it is characterised as the product of both divine revelation and human creativity. This human creativity is legitimately subject to scientific critical assessment. Men writes on this in his second letter to Volgin.

> The concept of the divine human character of Holy Scripture was formulated at the First Congress of Orthodox theologians in Athens (1936), in particular in the presentations of the representative of the Greek Orthodox Church, Archimandrite Antoniadis and the patriarch of Greek biblical scholars, Prof. Vasilios Vellas. And the representative of Russian theologians, Boris Ivanovich Sové..., said the following at the Congress: "The mechanically literal understanding of the divine inspiration of the Holy Books is the result of Jewish and conservative Protestant theology. It cannot be defended by Orthodox theologians as it is a particular kind of the 'Monophysite' deviation, and should be corrected in the light of the Chalcedonian dogma of divine-humanity. The participation of the human element with its *limitedness* in writing the Bible explains the specificities of the Old Testament books as historical sources, their mistakes and anachronisms, which can be corrected with extra-biblical data, which has enriched, especially in the last decades, the history of the Ancient East. A false apologetic view of the Bible as an encyclopedia of the historical and social sciences should be rejected. From this point of view the teaching concerning the Creation of the world, the global Flood and so on should be seen. The value of the Bible is in its theology." The same view was presented at the ceremonial opening of the St. Sergius Orthodox Theological Institute (February 1944): "As far as Patristic thought confirmed the status of the fullness of the actions of the natural human psyche and its reflection in the writings of the holy authors, methodological operations on the text and content of the Bible, which require scientific knowledge, are dogmatically justified and legitimised. Critical work is appropriate here, because it is applied to the human element that is subject to its authority: it is given here completely. Given, because the Bible is not only the Word of God, but a human word in their harmonious combination. More precisely, it is a divine-human word" (A. V. Kartashev, *On Old Testament Biblical Criticism,* Paris, 1947, p. 72).[361]

This extensive twentieth-century history of the term of course goes some way towards legitimising it as a principle of 'Russian Orthodox biblical interpretation'. The key element of this legitimation is, however, theological and christological rather than historical. By using the term 'divine-human' to describe Scripture, Men relates the divine inspiration of Scripture not only to the divine and human natures of Christ, but to John 1:14 ("the Word became flesh"), to Chalcedonian christology[362] and to the Orthodox teaching of synergy between the

[361] Мень А.прот. Два письма Владимиру Волгину.

[362] 'The Divine-human nature of the Holy Scriptures' (Богочеловеческая природа священного писания) in Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый, 145-146.

heavenly and earthly, which describes, in turn, the ecclesial expression of the Body of Christ with cosmic implications.[363] The contrasting 'Monophysite' use of 'literalist' interpretation (2.1.1) has negative consequences not only for how we approach Scripture, but for how we approach the Person of Christ. If it is heresy to claim that the two natures of Christ come together after their union to produce one nature, then it is equally heretical to claim the Bible has a uniform nature as the exclusive 'Word of God'.[364] As biblical literalism, Monophysitism also undermines the cosmic and universalist implications of divine-human interpretation, as it reduces biblical interpretation to the imposition of a 'static' ahistorical framework on Scripture.

Even if pioneering hermeneuticist Platon (Levshin)'s Fifth Rule allows for a christocentric interpretation of biblical texts, and his Eighth Rule considers the human component in the biblical text and its interpretation, he does not seem to be aware of the framework of divine-human theology.[365] This language finds its origins in the works of later theorists. Men chooses to ignore the fact that the Russian term 'divine-humanity' and its derivatives are nineteenth-century neologisms in the Russian language, primarily used not by members of the Russian Orthodox Church establishment, but by 'Russian school' figures. He applies the term anachronistically to Chalcedonian christology and the theological views of a number of pre-modern writers. Nonetheless, it should be noted that as a nineteenth-century neologism, in the period leading up to the 1917 Revolution the term 'divine-humanity' was regarded with some suspicion by the establishment. For example, the Holy Synod insisted that Mikhail Tareev change the name of his work *The Temptation of the God-Man* (*Iskushenie Bogocheloveka*) to

[363] Мень А.прот. К истории... 313.

[364] The words of Sové correspond with Tareev's critique of verbalism in *Foundations of Christianity:* Тареев М.М. Основы христианства. Том II. Евангелие. Сергиевъ Посадъ: Типографія Св.-Тр. Сергіевой Лавры, 1908, 14-15. з.1 tells us that the religious realisation of revealed content is freely unified with critical methods applied, avoiding a 'confusion' of the two spheres.

[365] Negrov, Alexander, *Biblical Interpretation in the Russian Orthodox Church*, 62.

The Temptation of Our Lord Jesus Christ for its second edition in 1900.[366] Intriguingly, by the late twentieth-century, the term had come to be accepted even by the most conservative Russian Orthodox authors, possibly due to the dependence of many of them on Men's work. Thus, Volgin, in his polemic against Men, happily refers to Christ as the 'God-man' (*bogochelovek*) while criticising his theological opponent for a 'Nestorian' overemphasis of Christ's humanity.[367] Both Volgin and Petukhov,[368] however, have reservations over the applicability of the term to the understanding of the divine inspiration of Scripture.

The most substantial 'Russian school' works concerned with the divine-humanity are, unlike those of Men, not primarily concerned with applying it to the divine inspiration of Scripture and its interpretation. Vladimir Solov′ev's famous series of lectures on divine-humanity (1881) is an attempt to develop a philosophical cosmism from Hegelian christological notions,[369] whereas Sergei Bulgakov's *On the Divine-humanity*, or *Great Trilogy*,[370] originally published in 1933, 1936 and 1945 is an extensive exposition of Christian dogma that begins with a detailed critical analysis of the christological teaching of the Church. In neither work is the link explicitly drawn between christology and the nature of Scripture. For this, Men had to refer to some of their lesser-known writings. For now, we limit our discussion to the ideas contained within Vladimir Solov′ev's 1886 *Introduction* (*Preduvedomlenie*) to *History and Future of Theocracy,* which, although not originally published in the earlier Russian editions of the work, contains, according to Men,[371] the clearest expression of Solov′ev's

[366] Тареев М.М. Искушение Господа нашего Иисуса Христа. М.: Печатня А.И. Снегировой, 1900: https://predanie.ru/tareev-mihail-mihaylovich/book/210560-iskusheniya-gospoda-nashego-iisusa-hrista/ [Accessed 26/07/2018].

[367] Антиминсов С.прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как комментатор священного писания. 43.

[368] Петухов А.свящ. К статье прот. А. Меня.... 4.

[369] Соловьев В.С. Чтения о Богочеловечестве.

[370] This includes *The Lamb of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), *The Comforter* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), and *The Bride of the Lamb* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), all translated by Boris Jakim.

[371] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том третий. 140. 'Preduvedomlenie' (Предуведомление) was replaced by the 'Predislovie' (Предисловие) for publication in 1887. 'Preduvedomlenie' was finally published in 1924 and reprinted as Соловьев В.С. Предуведомление – Собрание сочинений. Том одинадцатий. Брюссель: Foyer Oriental Chrétien, 1970, 68-83, together with an editorial introduction that explains its publication history.

divine-human hermeneutics.

Solov′ev summarised the influence of Western biblical studies on his own thought: “My faith in substantial truth and the divine (more precisely: divine-human) character of the Holy Scriptures has gained a significant victory in [my] consciousness and clarity due to acquaintance with the most recent biblical criticism, particularly of the negative school”.[372] This engagement with critical thought became the first significant characteristic of Solov′ev’s divine-human interpretation adopted by Men, a fact not lost on Men’s critics, who tend to lack enthusiasm for Solov′ev’s theology. Petukhov, in his response to Men’s article, takes exception to Men’s use of the results of biblical criticism under the guise of a ‘Patristic’ divine-human approach to the Bible. Although Petukhov does not establish Men’s dependence specifically on Solov′ev, he is certainly right that Men did not develop his divine-human theological basis for a critical approach to Scripture directly from reading of the Fathers. It is Men’s adoption of Solov′ev’s ideas that created the grounds for the introduction of Kartashev’s ‘new isagogics’ into his own biblical thought (2.1.3.2).

In order to establish what kind of theoretical basis is provided for Men by Solov′ev’s divine-human concept, we shall consider it in a little more detail. Although Solov′ev’s approach attempts to establish links with the Fathers through the tripartite christology of the Cappadocians, developed in opposition to the ideas of Apollinarius, it does not begin from the Patristic hermeneutics, but from his own philosophical presuppositions concerning the nature of human creativity and genius. He presents these most clearly in an analogy; those who undertake literary analysis of the works of Shakespeare are compared to biblical critics.

Imagine that somewhere there existed a literary school of passionate Shakespeare enthusiasts, and that

[372] Соловьев В.С. Предуведомление..., 73.

this school's correct evaluation of the exceptional genius and originality of Shakespeare's creativity was based on completely incorrect and even absurd presuppositions, precisely that all the material of Shakespeare's works was created without mediation and in its entirety by the genius of the poet himself.[373] A part of this school even came to the conclusion that Shakespeare did not use any prior sources, not only for the plots and characters of his dramas; even the combinations of words and all the separate words were created by him himself and every one of them taken in isolation is filled with his inspiration. Then imagine further that there is a new critical literary school, which begins by way of complex and thorough investigation to show that the English language existed before Shakespeare, that there were literary works in it that the poet used; then it is shown that all the plots and characters of Shakespeare's dramas were taken in part from different annals, in part from novels, and in part directly from other dramatic works, which were only revised by Shakespeare; finally, [it is shown] that many of the dramas ascribed to him did not belong to him at all. If now, from all these obtained details, the greater part of which are completely correct, but also in part doubtful and exaggerated, this school came to the conclusion that Shakespeare had no particular inspiration and original creativity at all – and some representatives of this school even proposed that Shakespeare never existed and all the works ascribed to him were put together by later compilers – then does the absurdity of such conclusions really destroy the utility of the investigations conducted and the factual details that have been obtained by this critical school?[374]

The assumption made that the absence of prior material is a necessary requirement for an expression of creative genius had been inherited, Solov′ev believed, from pre-critical thinking by the critical studies of modernity. Solov′ev uses his Shakespeare analogy to demonstrate the erroneous nature of this assumption. Even if critical thinking is able to give detailed explanations for the origins of biblical texts, the God-given creativity used in the human authorship of the biblical text should not be forgotten. Solov′ev appeals to Chalcedonian divine-human christology to explain this matter further, thus drawing a link with Patristic thought.

As in the living Logos, Divinity is inseparably and indivisibly unified with humanity, in the same way the divine and human natures are inseparably and indivisibly unified in the written Word of God. And as in Christ the human nature presents itself not only externally, not only through body or flesh, but through a rational soul, in the same way in the Holy Scriptures the human element consists not only of external material (symbols, language and so forth), but extends to all its content, including the soul and mind of Scripture.[375]

The critical school ignored this 'rational' or 'soulful' aspect of the humanity of Scripture,

[373] The parallel is with Eastern Orthodoxy and Tridentine Catholicism. Solov′ev (Предуведомление 75) and Men (Библиологический словарь. Том третий. 140) criticise such contentless notions of divine inspiration.

[374] Соловьев В.С. Предуведомление, 73-74, see Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том третий. 140.

[375] Соловьев В.С. Предуведомление, 75-76, see Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том третий. 140-141.

which reflects the creative potential of the human being made in the Image of God. Unfortunately, this leads to an *a priori* rejection of the divine aspect of Scripture, because, according to Cappadocian anthropological and christological teaching, the divine aspect can only be approached through the rational element. A denial of this would be 'Apollinarianism' in biblical hermeneutics, which was seen by the 'Russian school' figures as a form of 'Monophysitism'.[376] Conservatives of the Russian Orthodox Church have in common with the critical school that they fail to see the significance of the 'rational' 'soulful' aspect of the humanity of Scripture. If the Bible's divinity leads those studying it to perceive it as an untouchable holy artefact, then that would be to "sin against the Holy Spirit, speaking through the prophets",[377] since the divinity of Scripture is only accessible through the fullness of its humanity. Solov′ev and Men both believed that by emphasising the 'rational' side of the humanity of Scripture, we not only gain access to the 'divinity' of the scriptural text, but make false supernaturalist assertions unnecessary.

Men preferred to cite what he referred to as the divine-human views of the Fathers and when discussing divine inspiration he referred to Sové and Kartashev as more ecclesially acceptable figures than Solov′ev, but it should not be doubted that Solov′ev is the source of these views, as shown by Men's *Dictionary* article on the philosopher.[378]

It is therefore sensible to suggest that frequent uses of the term 'divine-humanity' to describe the character of biblical revelation in Men's 'religious histories' carry the semantic weight of Solov′evian thought on the divine-humanity of biblical inspiration.[379] A divine-human

[376] See discussions of the 'rational soul' in, for example, *Letters 101 and 102* by Gregory of Nazianzus, written in response to the views of Apollinarius: Gregory of Nazianzus, *On God and Christ: the five theological orations and two letters to Cledonius,* ed. Frederick Williams and Lionel Wickham (Crestwood: SVS, 2002).

[377] 'When did the Jewish Prophets live?': Соловьев В. С. Когда жили еврейские пророки? - Собрание сочинений. Том седмой. Брюссель: Foyer Oriental Chrétien, 1970, 180-200, 200. Men equates this approach with verbalism. See Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том третий. 141.

[378] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том третий. 138-143.

[379] This is not an exhaustive list, merely a list of representative examples. In *Wellsprings* (Men, Alexander, *The*

approach to biblical hermeneutics both establishes the validity of 'scientific' biblical study and refuses to delegate exclusive authority to it, since such 'scientific' study cannot be the only component of the 'humanity' of Scripture. A theological account of human creativity in biblical authorship is necessary for establishing a full interpretive methodology.[380]

Although Men obviously uses the term 'divine-humanity' to draw a correspondence between the nature of Scripture and the Person of Christ, the term is applied differently to Christ and Scripture in one respect. While Christ's individual Person expressed perfect humanity and divinity from the beginning, through the lengthy harmonisation of Jewish and universal elements that make up the 'humanity' of Scripture, access to the divine was only gradually revealed and these elements "only in [their] wholeness, in [their] completion, [are] carrier[s] of divine perfection".[381] In the case of Scripture, a historical relation to the 'whole', which Men understands as the 'Biblical world' (2.1.3.1), is necessary for separate parts to be considered divine. Western biblical thinkers who limit themselves to scientific-historical criticism cannot see this 'whole' and are therefore unable to understand the divinity of separate parts.[382] If the role of critical thought in biblical interpretation is to explicate the interrelatedness of its themes, and thus express the 'whole' as fully as possible, divine-human interpretation insists that the 'whole' does not consist merely of historical connections. It is a metaphysical entity or 'Biblical world' that reflects a divine reality. The interpretive

Wellsprings of Religion, Мень А.прот. Истоки религии: Природа веры. Человек во Вселенной. Перед лицом Сущего. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011) the 'divine-humanity' has a cosmic aspect (113 (Russian), 119 (English)); in *Magic Art and Monotheism* (Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие), exegesis has a 'divine-human' nature (468); in *Son of Man* (Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий), Christ's blood is described as a 'divine-human' sacrifice (255) and the cosmology of Paul (Rom. 8:19) is 'divine-human' (186-9); in *First Apostles* (Мень А.прот. Первые Апостолы), 1 Cor. 15:28 is interpreted by an appeal to the 'divine humanity' (246); in *Messengers* (Мень А.прот. Вестники), the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53 has a 'divine-human' role (350, see also Мень А.прот. Исагогика (432), the city of Ezekiel 48:35, called 'The Lord is There', is a 'divine-human' image (330), the 'Deuteronomic History' is described as a 'divine-human' philosophy of history (340), Ezra's 'fanatical' reform is a necessary component of Israel's 'divine-human' history (442); in *Threshold* (Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета. книги I-II) history is described as a 'divine-human' drama (I:82), and the Church, Eucharist and liturgy have a 'divine-human' quality (I:94-5).

380 Мень А.прот. Библия и литература, 184-186.

381 Соловьев В.С. Предуведомление, 76.

382 Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том третий. 141.

methodology espoused by Men in his 'religious histories' seeks to take account of the divine Word present in Scripture, the human creativity involved in creating it, and the 'historical-literary' aspect of the biblical texts that may be subjected legitimately to critical study, relating each of these to the divine-human 'whole'.

2.2.3) The Ecclesial Principle

As the primary reality for Orthodox Christians the Church is the measuring line by which texts and their interpretations are to be assessed. Scripture, in turn, can only be understood as the written expression of the ecclesiality of the Church, which is also a divine-human reality. Men accentuates this chronological and consequent ontological primacy of the Church over Scripture by citing Ilarion Troitskii.

> The Church existed even when not a single book of the New Testament had been written. The books of the New Testament were written by the Apostles afterwards, in the course of more than half a century from the beginning of the historical existence of the Church. In the books written by them the Apostles left a record of their oral evangelical preaching. They are written for a Church that already exists.[383]

So far, little has been said that is controversial in Eastern Orthodox thought, but as we approach the question of how the ecclesiality of the Church is to be characterised for the purposes of interpreting Scripture, things get more difficult. Men's distinction, for example, between ecclesial and Patristic principles is not a common one in the Orthodox literature on the subject. Platon (Levshin) refers to the Fathers in his ninth rule as though their writings represent the interpretation of the Church,[384] and Volgin in his article regards 'Patristic' interpretation as synonymous with that of the Church, thus identifying Men's first and third principles.

[383] Мень А.прот. К истории... 315-316, Иларион (Троицкий). Священное Писание и Церковь. М.: 1914. 17.

[384] Negrov, Alexander, *Biblical Interpretation in the Russian Orthodox Church*, 62

There are two aspects of Men's ecclesial thinking that serve to elucidate why he chooses to differentiate the two principles in this way. First, the term 'Church' does not only apply to an empirical phenomenon that arose after Christ. It is closely linked to Solov′ev's understanding of Covenant and refers both to Old and New Testament communities of faith. Second, Men centres the authority of the Church, including for the purposes of interpreting Scripture, in its Eucharistic practice. Notions of hierarchical or sacred authority are subservient to this.

2.2.3.1) The Old Testament Church

Building on a theological concept used by Sergei Bulgakov,[385] Men speaks of the 'Old Testament Church' as the body of those faithful to the Lord, through whom He is revealed. "The Old Testament Church lives everywhere where there are faithful ones who confess the Creator and listen to His will".[386] It is through this pre-Christian ecclesial expression that the canon of the Old Testament was formed. The 'Old Testament Church' is a theme of Men's *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life,* especially the final two volumes, *Messengers of the Kingdom of God* and *On the Threshold of the New Covenant.* Although the earlier *Magic Art and Monotheism* has a developmental rather than static understanding of the ecclesial community it does not yet directly refer to the 'Old Testament Church'.[387] In this work the ecclesial community develops against the backdrop of ancient polytheism and is conditioned through the experience of living in Egypt and subsequent wanderings in Sinai. This is not a reductive account. The nature of the ecclesial community cannot be wholly explicated by

[385] Bulgakov, Sergius, *The Lamb of God,* 166 and in Russian Булгаков С.прот. Агнецъ Божій. О Богочеловѣчествѣ. Часть I. Париж: YMCA-PRESS, 1933, 189. *The Bride of the Lamb,* 254.

[386] Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета. книга I, 288.

[387] On Abraham: "amid the shadows of polytheism there arose that seed in world history that was destined to grow, spread and turn into the People of the Covenant, the People of God, the Old Testament predecessor of the Church." Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие, 180. On the Exodus: "Yahweh showed His will and created His People, who were destined to become 'a priestly kingdom and a holy people', in other words, the Church." Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие, 432.

context and experience, but is also, in the most absolute sense, the revelation of God, an expression of his will in history.

The 'Old Testament Church' is first explicitly referred to in *Messengers* with respect to the exilic community of faith. Men writes, "the time had come when the Old Testament Church should test its resilience in an alien, pagan world"[388] and "The Old Testament Church had become a homeless wanderer".[389] The City of the Lord in Ezekiel 48:35 offers hope for regeneration following this difficult time of testing, and indeed, according to Men, this vision was partially fulfilled in the post-exilic period. "After the exile the Old Testament Church really did in one sense live in agreement with the prevision of Ezekiel: the ways of falling away ended, idols no longer tempted Israel, the temple and faith took on far greater significance than earlier".[390] Although the universalistic implications of Ezekiel's vision had to wait for the New Testament period in order to be fully realised, from the exile onwards the pre-Christian ecclesial community was progressively sundered from its political moorings and ethical and religious questions began to take precedence over political and national ones. This, in turn, created the context for the post-exilic period, where although "the Old Testament Church was no longer limited by the boundaries of Palestine... the metropolis [Jerusalem] retained a leading role in religious life as before".[391]

Thus the term 'Old Testament Church' emphasises the progressive universalising tendencies of the Old Testament ecclesial community, setting up a dialectic between present reality and future vision, a dialectic that continues in the Church of the New Testament period and leads towards the establishment of what we have termed a 'divine-human culture'.

---

[388] Мень А.прот. Вестники..., 275.
[389] Мень А.прот. Вестники..., 348.
[390] Мень А.прот. Вестники..., 330.
[391] Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета. книга I, 167.

The ethical and religious principles of the 'Old Testament Church' that gradually came to predominate over political exclusivity were expressed in the Torah, which, according to Men, had its roots in the historical figure of Moses.[392] Of necessity, this ecclesial community of faith had to develop its own interpretive principles for studying the Torah. Men cites a text from the Talmud that probably, he believes, finds its origins in the Second Temple Period.

> "Be careful in your reasoning, make more disciples, make a defence for the Torah." The meaning of these sayings, despite their terseness, is clear. Interpretation of the Law demands great circumspection, "disciples" are those who completely devote themselves to the study of the Law, and the word about "defence" warns against alien influence. By "Torah" in this context is probably meant not only the Pentateuch, but all the varied instructions that entered into the oral tradition of the Old Testament Church.[393]

In Men's account these interpretive principles have two interesting qualities. If, on the one hand, the ecclesial community was closed to alien influence when it undertook scriptural interpretation, the Torah itself was not 'closed', since a rigid canon had not yet been established. In other words, there were stricter rules for who was doing the interpreting than for what was being interpreted. The parallels between this and Negrov's account of the interpretive practices of Medieval Russia are striking. Before the Slavonic Bible was published and its canon definitively established, it was often the case that those who were theologically inclined read and commented on whatever religious literature came their way.[394] The same kind of canonical fluidity is reflected in Men's account of the practices of Second Temple scholars. In both cases the oral communication of 'Scripture' was just as important as its written transfer and acted as a simultaneous process of remembering and interpreting.

---

[392] Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие, 321.
[393] Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета. книга I, 169.
[394] Indeed, the Slavonic Bible was published initially to combat 'heretical', for example Bogomil, literature, emanating from Constantinople: Negrov, Alexander, *Biblical Interpretation in the Russian Orthodox Church*, 32.

All of this clearly emphasises the priority of the ecclesial community over the text, as in both cases the ecclesial community is a definable entity long before any scriptural canon. As we have established above, following Ilarion Troitskii, this priority of the ecclesial community is something that in Russian Orthodoxy does not recede even when the canon has been definitively established. In creating a strict 'canon' of allowable Patristic texts to be used for interpreting scripture in the manner of Volgin, there is a risk of undermining this dynamic relation between the ecclesial community and its scriptures. Men seeks to avoid this with the combination of exegetical inclusivity and a dynamic, critical relation to the Fathers. This is impossible if the writings of the Fathers and the teachings of the Church are simply identified. Men therefore distinguishes between his first and third principles.

If we return to our remark above that one of the principal characteristics of Men's account of the Old Testament Church is its progressive universalizing tendency, we can also say that one result of distinguishing the ecclesial principle from the Patristic principle is an emphasis on the continuation of this universalising tendency in the ongoing life of the Church, and this includes textual interpretation. This in turn validates an ever increasing diversity in scriptural genres and interpretive voices. The 'Church' and its scriptures are mutually conditioned, yet the ecclesial principle transforms the interpretive process into a dynamic and developing entity influenced by both the changing nature of canon and tradition, as well as changes in the community, its geographical location and historical context. It is because of this that literary art and other forms of art can take a significant interpretive role (Chapter Four).

In turning to the Old Testament, which was produced over the course of several hundred years, it is therefore unsurprising that we find a very complex and diverse text. Men, for example, writes on the inclusion of Wisdom literature in the Canon. "The Old Testament

Church, and following it the New Testament Church, recognised that in these books is preserved the same divine Revelation as in the Torah and the Prophets. With this, it was held that the Word of the Lord could be given to humans in the most varied of forms".[395] That Jesus Ben Sira, the writer of Ecclesiasticus, neither knew the Apocalypse of Isaiah, nor the Book of Job demonstrates "just how complicated the life of the Old Testament Church was, and just how many independent currents existed within it".[396] According to Men, the most extreme example of this variety in scriptural content and style is the book of Ecclesiastes, which appears to be an explicit contradiction of biblical faith and hope. Despite acknowledging this, Men describes its inclusion as an expression of the "deep wisdom of the Old Testament Church", because it destroys the idea that the "highest good is limited by earthly boundaries", thus establishing a dialectic with other scriptural understandings of the 'highest good'.[397]

This variety of content and style is not found to the same extent in the New Testament Scriptures, but this is not because they were produced in a radically different way. Men believed the apostles involved in the composition of Scripture were also its interpreters in just the same manner as the Old Testament prophets. The New Testament was also formed by a progressive process of remembering and interpretation, but over a shorter period of time.[398] The New Testament Canon was formed not only by its writers, but the New Testament Church that interpreted and validated its texts.

In this the authors of the New Testament writings and the New Testament Church that compiled them took their lead from none other than Jesus Christ Himself and the

[395] Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета. книга I, 171.
[396] Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета. книга I, 279.
[397] Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета. книга I, 233.
[398] Мень А.прот. Таинство, слово и образ. Ленинград: Ферро-Логас, 1991, 8.

hermeneutical approach He adopted with respect to the Law and the Prophets.

> Christ taught about the Bible as divine revelation and recognised the necessity of a living Church-tradition, which would disclose its meaning. Therefore He said to the people about the Pharisees, "Do all that they tell you" (Matthew 23:3). If, however, the teachers of the Law often added to the Law hundreds of meticulous rules, then Jesus returned the Old Testament to its sources, to the Ten Commandments of Sinai, to the true inheritance of Moses, preserved by the Prophets.[399]

Jesus, the Son of Man who has authority over the Law, himself presents us with a hermeneutic that is historically conditioned and ecclesial.[400]

2.2.3.2) The Eucharist

If variety and inclusivity in the interpretation of Scripture are demanded by its ecclesial nature, then how can the Church avoid becoming the valueless conglomeration of a relativised plurality of voices? In other words, what is the Church's methodology for according authority to one interpretation over another? General appeals to the unity of the ecclesial tradition fail to establish the locus of that authority. In theory, ecclesial tradition could just as easily take as its point of departure the decisions of councils and the writings of established Fathers, or 'practical' and liturgical interpretations. Men clearly has more sympathy for the latter, but this leads him into conflict with those who view things differently, as in the case of Volgin. By adopting a more inclusive approach to interpretation, he leaves the question of arbitration open, and this, of course, means that he can only partially resolve the questions we set out above.

Establishing the locus of authority within the ecclesial community has in fact been one of the most violently contested issues in the history of the Russian Orthodox Church. Vladimir

[399] Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий. 104.
[400] Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий. 124.

Solov′ev discusses the matter in his *Foreword* (*Predislovie*) to *History and Future of Theocracy.* According to him, the Great Schism of the seventeenth century was a disagreement over this very question. The Old Believers, for example Protopope Avvakum,[401] wished to claim the liturgical practice of the church as the locus of authority for all matters of faith, whereas the Orthodox, for example Patriarch Nikon, wished to absolutise the authority of the ecclesiastical hierarchy and its decisions as the primary authority.[402] The dispute could not be resolved and led to a schism just as antagonistic as the Reformation in the West. Attempts to reconcile the opposing poles of this conflict created the context for later Russian formulations of ecclesiality. The early nineteenth-century appeal to the concept of *sobornost′*, led by the leading slavophile Khomyakov,[403] became one of the most significant of these attempts. Men's understanding of ecclesiality, however, draws most heavily on the early twentieth-century eucharistic theology of Nikolai Afanas′ev who established a 'Eucharistic' version of Khomyakov's *sobornost′*. In this Men has much in common with his Orthodox contemporaries in the West, Alexander Schmemann and John Zizioulas.[404]

In Men's *beseda The Power of the Church is the Power of Christ,* he calls Afanas′ev "one of the most significant ecclesiologists of our century", who gave the most detailed account of the relationship between the Church as community and the Sacraments of the Church.[405] Men very briefly summarises the content of Afanas′ev's books.[406]

---

401 Men positively assesses Avvakum's attempts to provide a practical, edifying commentary on biblical texts for ordinary Russians: 'Avvakum Petrov' in Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый, 23-24 and 'The Bible and Ancient Russian Literature', Мень А.прот. Библия и литература. 58-66.

402 Соловьев. В.С. Исторія и будущность теократіи, 244-246.

403 Соловьев. В.С. Исторія и будущность теократіи, 253-255.

404 Zizioulas, John, *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church,* (Crestwood NY: SVS Press, 1997) refers to Afanas′ev throughout, Schmemann's tribute Шмеман А. Памяти отца Николая Афанасьева. - Вестник РСХД, 1955. №82. 65-68.

405 Сила Церкви есть сила Христова. Беседа о миропомазании, Мень А.прот. Церковь и мы. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2015. 230.

406 Служение мирян в Церкви; Трапеза Господня; Церковь Духа Святого: https://azbyka.ru/otechnik/Nikolaj_Afanasev/ [Accessed 08/07/18].

> Using … Patristic and other materials he shows that the Church is a community of people committed to God, in other words saints, and God's action in it (the action of Christ through the Spirit) is effected by the whole Church, for "you are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation".[407] We are all priests of God most high. What, then, is the role of the cleric in this? He is a servant. Clerics are organs of the Church, functionally created for carrying out the operational-material aspect of the Sacrament....[408]

From this it is clear that for Men it is the liturgy and Eucharist, as an expression of the concrete reality of the ecclesial community, that take precedence over the ecclesial hierarchy. As a practice that not only expresses and incorporates the life of the Church, but draws on both the Old Testament Passover and the Last Supper of the Gospel accounts, the Eucharistic liturgy is the central pillar of ecclesial expression. The participant in it is given a liturgical context from which sacred history is interpreted. Men tells us the following.

> In setting the foundation of the Old Testament Church, Moses gave it a sign of togetherness, the blood of the paschal lamb. In the Jerusalem Temple sacrifice preserved the character of a cultic feast. It, like the Passover feast, had two aspects: an assertion of the integrity of the People of God and faith in the presence of the Lord with it [the People of God]. In the period immediately prior to the New Testament, prayer feasts outside the Temple became one of the most significant rituals of Judaism. They were accompanied by Bible reading and conversations about the faith. The most important part was the blessing of bread and wine and likewise the prayer of thankfulness, in which the good actions of God that have happened in Sacred History were recollected.[409]

The Russian Orthodox liturgy provides a context that interprets a variety of texts from both Old and New Testaments, for example in Psalm-singing, christocentrically and eucharistically. The Eucharistic meeting is itself in continuity with the synagogal meetings of the post-exilic period, where reading and singing scriptural texts became accepted practice.[410] Crucially, Old Testament texts provide more than just information; they are prototypes of the New Covenant and are portrayed in the Eucharistic liturgy as such.[411] Indeed, despite the sacramental centrality of the Eucharist itself, Men's emphasis on the historical and revelatory

---

[407] 1 Peter 2:9.
[408] Мень А.прот. Церковь и мы. 230-231.
[409] Men's footnote: "The bread and wine were mentioned as symbols of brotherly union as early as in the biblical story about Abraham (Gen. 14:18)." Мень А.прот. Таинство, слово и образ, 36-37.
[410] Мень А.прот. Таинство, слово и образ, 48.
[411] Мень А.прот. Таинство, слово и образ, 50.

continuity between the two Testaments and the Orthodox liturgy apportioned interpretive significance to the entirety of the Church's liturgical practice (4.1.1). This allowed him, for example, to see special interpretive significance in the Church festival celebrating the meeting of Simeon and Jesus Christ, the Old and New Testament Churches,[412] where the *Nunc dimittis* is sung.[413] In this the Orthodox Church gives liturgical validation to the words of Simeon, in which "the Old Testament Church itself spoke" concerning the identity of Christ.[414]

Although his work *Sacrament, Word and Image* is specifically an exposition of the Russian Orthodox liturgy,[415] it is clear from his frequent citations of Catholic authors who wrote on the topic, such as Louis Bouyer, that Men saw validity in the Eucharistic practices of other traditions. He was drawn also to the cosmic, universalising qualities of Teilhard de Chardin's poem *Mass on the World*[416] and spoke of it with great admiration.[417]

An interesting implication of Men's appeal to the Eucharistic practice of the Church as the locus of ecclesial authority is that all believers partaking in the Eucharist, whether Russian Orthodox or not, become 'saints' capable of valid scriptural interpretation. As we have seen, Men is happy to refer to scriptural interpreters from the Roman Catholic Church or Protestant

[412] The *Sretenie Gospodnya* (Сретение Господня). *Sretenie* is an Old Slavonic word for 'encounter' or 'meeting': Мень А.прот. Таинство, слово и образ, 77.

[413] Мень А.прот. Таинство, слово и образ, 32.

[414] Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета. книга II, 179, Luke 2:25-35.

[415] Таинство, слово и образ.

[416] Teilhard de Chardin, Pierre *Hymn of the Universe,* (London: Fontana, 1970), Chapter One.

[417] «Сие творите в Мое воспоминание», Мень А.прот. Церковь и мы. 205. Here Teilhard has much in common with Bulgakov's universalising ecclesiology, also familiar to Men: in *Unfading Light,* the sophiological realisation of God's intent takes place ecclesially in the Church. Thus, in *The Bride of the Lamb*, 253, 'the Church is the very foundation of creation, its inner entelechy', and 'divine-humanity *in actu*, in its eternal being and in its creaturely becoming'. In *The Bride of the Lamb*, 257-8, Bulgakov refers to Ephesians 1:23 ("his body, the fullness of him who fills all in all") to support the cosmic 'all-unity' of the Church, conceived sophiologically. "The Incarnation of Christ accomplishes the unification of divine and creaturely life, man's deification, which is precisely the power of the heavenly Church manifested in the earthly Church. The sophiological interpretation overcomes the otherwise insurmountable difficulties posed by applying both the conception of [Eph.1:23]… and the conception of the Church's pilgrimage in the world, *ekklesia paroikousa* to the definition of the Church. The Church is the unity of the supra-eternal Divine Sophia and the becoming creaturely Sophia."

denominations as well as the Russian Orthodox Church. Communion with the Divine-humanity is the foundation of authority in exegetical matters, since Scripture is interpreted by the Person of Christ through the Holy Spirit in all Christians. These interpreters could just as easily be scientists as priests or theologians. The ecclesial principle does not require a rejection of science and history any more than Men's other principles, which is critical to Men's apologetic endeavours.[418] The ensuing divine-human culture does away with boundaries between confessions and sacred and secular vocations. Admittedly, when the *ecclesia* is understood in this way, a huge mass of voices comes together, and due to this plurality, assessing the respective value of different interpretations remains problematic. Men, it seems, attempts to realise the breadth of his ecclesial principle by appealing in his written works not just to the Fathers and Saints of the Orthodox Church, but to an enormous variety of sources, including the 'Russian school', Western biblical scholars and the representatives of many academic disciplines related to biblical studies. Where he is critical of a particular interpretation of scriptural texts, it tends to be because that interpretation refuses to recognise the universalising nature of the ecclesial community. Perhaps the most surprising example concerns not a Church Father or Saint, but a biblical character. While recognising its dialectical value, he characterises Ezra's interpretation of the Torah as 'fanatical' and his victory as "one of the dark pages of the post-exilic history of Israel".[419]

2.2.4) The Polysemantic Principle

Men's final principle is an undisguised expression of exegetical inclusivity. If we follow Patristic thinking on the matter of interpretation then we are forced to accept that not only one, but many, methods are required.[420] These include typological, ethical-practical,

[418] Мень А.прот. К истории... 316.
[419] Мень А.прот. Вестники..., 439.
[420] Мень А.прот. К истории... 318-9.

historical-literary and historical approaches, which do not exclude, but complement one another. Men's *Dictionary* article on *Old Hermeneutics*, discussed above (2.1.3.3), lists these Patristic methods in a similar way to his article.[421]

Unfortunately, however, in recent years, not all Russian Orthodox commentators have seen the Fathers in this 'polysemantic' way. Men believed in a productive 'internal discussion' between the representatives of a 'formal-patristic' approach (for example, Volgin) and those who reject the 'automatic copying' of the Fathers in favour of following their 'fundamental principles' (the second kind of approach to the Patristic principle, 2.2.1).[422] In this way, the 'formal-patristic' approach of conservatives is accepted as something of dialectical value in the same way as Ezra's reforms, but relativised, while a reversion to 'fundamental principles' must take place through a process of ongoing conflict.[423] Men believed that the conflicts of his own day over this were a continuation of the disputes between interpreters of the ecclesiastical establishment and the so-called 'Russian school' before 1917. This led to a fruitful engagement with radical criticism as the Revolution approached, and there is no reason why such engagement should not continue and develop further in the 1970s and 80s.

That Men claims the Fathers approached scriptural interpretation in multiple ways is not as controversial as his attempt to use this as a foundation for the validation of the results of critical study. Influential Russian Orthodox interpreters have tended to take a measured approach to the polysemantic principle. Platon (Levshin), for example, does accept the simultaneous validity of different approaches to biblical interpretation, but with some caution. His second rule tells us we should "interpret spiritual and mysterious meanings,

[421] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том третий. 174.
[422] Мень А.прот. К истории... 318-9.
[423] Men's parallel discussion of Ezra and Ruth shows the dialectical relationship of conservatism and universalising tendencies: Мень А.прот. Вестники..., 439-441.

especially in the Old Testament, in those passages where such meanings are transparently concealed". In doing this, however, "one has to be cautious so as not to do this with force." On this basis it seems unlikely that he would have countenanced the kind of allegorical interpretation of Genesis 1-3 favoured by Men with his evolutionist presuppositions. Platon's main emphasis, as made clear in his first rule, was the literal meaning of the words, and he does not appear to have viewed historical or literary analysis as an appropriate component of interpretation.[424]

Men's own application of the polysemantic principle may therefore be seen as a consequence of the way he has elaborated his other three principles, including the way he allowed his own Solov′evian biblical theology to lie at the heart of his biblical interpretation. If the Fathers are to be subjected to interpretive analysis themselves, the divine-humanity of Scripture allows for both the human and divine aspects of Scripture to be treated seriously, and the Church contains a multitude of valid interpretive voices centred on the Eucharistic sacrament, then, of course, many different approaches may be taken to the same text.

In 2.2.3.2 we asked what, according to Men, is the Church's methodology for giving authority to one interpretation over another? If there are conflicting interpretations then it would seem that one particular approach should take precedence. At the end of our discussion we remarked that the question of how an interpretation is accorded authority is not fully resolved by his eucharistic and liturgical approach to ecclesiology, because such an approach results in the simultaneous validation of a huge mass of different interpretations. Men, however, prefers to leave contradiction, conflict and interpretive tensions unresolved, instead seeing the conflict itself as productive. In this way, he shows the influence of the dialectical philosophy of absolute idealism, albeit mediated from Hegel through certain 'Russian school'

[424] Negrov, Alexander, *Biblical Interpretation in the Russian Orthodox Church*, 61-62.

thinkers such as Sergei Trubetskoi, Pavel Florensky and Sergei Bulgakov. For Men, this ecclesial progression of consciousness does not pass through or lead to 'logical' resolution in the way it does for Hegel in his *Phenomenology of Spirit*.[425] Following Florensky in particular, 'antinomy' is part of the fundamental structure of reality, which is best expressed in dogmatic theology, which in turn is the highest expression of biblical truth.[426] Men tells us the following in *Wellsprings.*

> Fundamental Christian dogma is distinguished by inner contradiction, paradox, antinomy, which are insurmountable for the methods of formal logic.... Teachings about Triunity and divine-humanity were born from mystical enlightenment, which in the imperfect language of ideas, takes a dialectical, contradictory form.[427]

Men's interpretive approach is in marked contrast with that of Platon (Levshin) who presented a methodology for resolving all biblical 'contradictions' in his sixth rule.

From reading *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life,* it is clear that Men found antinomy both in the literary aspects of certain biblical texts, and, as is especially evident in his *Wellsprings,* in the structure of reality presented by modern scientific investigation and philosophy. An example of the former may be found in Men's discussion of the Book of Job in *Threshold.* The problem of evil is presented as the "antinomy of freedom and Providence", before which the "limited mind stops, not having the power to enclose existence in the framework of a system".[428] Further, Men links the appropriation of Old Testament texts by early Christians to the development of antinomical doctrinal formulations. They did not "fear to express antinomically the truths of Revelation".[429] The key antinomical doctrinal

[425] Men does not use the triadic formulations of the *Phenomenology of Spirit*.

[426] 'Letter Six: Contradiction' in Florensky, Pavel, *The Pillar and Ground of the Truth: An Essay in Orthodox Theodicy in Twelve Letters,* translated Boris Jakim, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), which was, according to Men (Мень А.прот. Русская религиозная философия, 312), "written with the power of genius".

[427] The first part of this citation follows MacNaughton: Men, Alexander, *The Wellsprings of Religion,* 117.The second part is my own translation of the Russian text: Мень А.прот. Истоки религии. 111.

[428] Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета. книга I, 216-217.

[429] Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета. книга I, 332.

formulation, however, is found in the divine-humanity of Chalcedonian christology, which Men tells us is the central truth revealed by Christ, yet its Truth must remain logically irresolvable. If the divine-humanity is antinomical, then so is its ecclesial expression, the Church, which is the crucible for all genuine religious experience.

If the divine-humanity is antinomical, then it should be no surprise that for Men the reality portrayed by modern science is also antinomical. The concept of 'religious experience', before we even begin to talk of Christian doctrine, has an 'antinomical' symbolism paralleled by several modern scientific theories, such as the extension theory of Niels Bohr.[430]

In this way, as a fitting expression of antinomical truth, the concept of the 'symbol' takes on great importance. Symbols loosen the epistemological connection between words and reality and create space for the avoidance of 'Monophysite' literalism. Men refers back to the Fathers who developed an 'apophatic' approach to theological language. Origen, Dionysius the Areopagite and Maximus the Confessor are mentioned alongside what Men considers to be more recent examples:[431] the 'intuitionism' of Henri Bergson, Nikolai Lossky and Pavel Florensky.

> Religious symbols unveil that which has been apprehended by inner intuitive vision, whereas speculative philosophy construes it as a fact, which has to be brought into line where possible with discursive thinking. So then we are not condemned to an isolated existence on islands of individual consciousness and experience. There are bridges between these islands: and these bridges are concepts and signs, symbols and doctrines.[432]

Individual consciousness and experience, when engaging in scriptural interpretation, are not

[430] Мень А.прот. Истоки религии. 51, Men, Alexander, *The Wellsprings of Religion,* 59.

[431] Men, Alexander, *The Wellsprings of Religion,* 115. Men's reception of these Fathers was not uncritical. In *Dictionary,* Men discussed them and noted the significance of the Dionysian attempt to interpret Scripture, by entering "inside the sacred symbols", while recognising the limitations of Dionysian ahistoricism: Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый, 353. Maximus the Confessor, following Dionysius, rather too often relied on allegorical interpretive methods, although he did recognise the divine-human nature of Scripture: Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том второй, 171.

[432] Men, Alexander, *The Wellsprings of Religion,* 118.

things to be grasped, but intuitive visions may be expressed antinomically in symbolic form as expressions of the inexpressible.

2.2.5) Summary

Men's four principles for Russian Orthodox biblical interpretation at first glance seem uncontroversial, but upon closer assessment, they indicate the interrelations between his 'Russian school' biblical theology and his biblical interpretation, which are more controversial. Referring to a Patristic principle is unproblematic for a Russian Orthodox biblical scholar, but Men's desire to follow the 'spirit' of Patristic interpretation, rather than simply cite florilegia taken from Patristic commentaries runs the risk of blurring lines between dogmatic and exegetical concerns. In practice, although he knew Patristic literature quite well, Men was rather 'creative' with his use of it, believing that some Patristic authors were more relevant to his ministerial concerns than others. He somewhat unusually admired Justin Martyr and even more unusually viewed Origen and Theodore of Mopsuestia positively, despite the respective condemnations of these two at the Fifth Ecumenical Council.

Men's divine-human principle connected biblical interpretation with christology in a manner not dissimilar to Karl Barth's *Church Dogmatics I.2.*[433] A short text by Vladimir Solov′ev was Men's primary inspiration. Solov′ev drew connections between the human creativity of the biblical authors and the rational soul in Cappadocian christology. Both conservatives, who wished to avoid any form of historical or literary analysis, and radical critics, who emphasised such analysis to the detriment of any other approach, had ignored this aspect of

[433] Barth, Karl, *The Church Dogmatics Vol. I.2,* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1956), 463-466. It seems unlikely that Men had encountered Barth's *Church Dogmatics* as it is not in the bibliography for Men's *Dictionary* article on Karl Barth: Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый, 114.

the biblical text at their peril. Men's divine-human interpretation was related to the divine-human nature of the biblical text and its theological narrative. While the individual components of the Bible are the products of human creativity and historical context, it is only in its 'whole' that the Bible may be considered divine revelation.

Men, unusually for an Orthodox biblical scholar, first distinguished an ecclesial principle from the Patristic principle and then explained it in relation to the divine-human christological principle. He emphasised the ontological priority of the ecclesial community over the word of Scripture, but based his 'ecclesial' ideas on those of the 'Russian school'. In *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life,* he used Bulgakov's term 'Old Testament Church' to refer to the ecclesial community of the Old Testament, thus emphasising its continuity with the Church of the New Testament and its inherent universalising tendency. At times the community drew inspiration from its texts for further creativity and at other times resorted to a static textual legalism that could only inhibit further religious progress (Ezra). This dialectical relation between the community and its texts continues to the present day, demonstrating the universalising tendency of God's revelation through his people. This means, for one thing, that the spiritual culture of antiquity and the secular culture of the Soviet Union may both be incorporated within the universalising dialectic of the divine-humanity. Separating the ecclesial and Patristic principles allows room for the Church to realise this divine-human culture both by creatively interpreting Patristic texts and emphasising unfamiliar aspects of the tradition. Men's ecclesiology was also strongly influenced by the Eucharistic ecclesiology of Nikolai Afanas′ev, in that it had a sacramental centre and content. The centre of ecclesial authority in matters of interpretation is not the ecclesiastical establishment, but the Eucharistic liturgy itself, the ecclesial expression of the divine-humanity, which leads to the acceptance of a multiplicity of interpretive voices in a

divine-human culture.

This leads to Men's polysemantic principle, which validates the use of very different methodologies for exegesis and very different, even in some cases contradictory, exegetical opinions. Following Florensky in particular, Men believed that the very structure of reality was antinomical, and best expressed symbolically by apparently contradictory dogmatic formulations.

Men's use of these interpretive principles betrays a deep engagement with 'Russian school' thinking. The Patristic thought of Tareev, the divine-human ideas of Solov′ev, the Old Testament Church of Bulgakov, the Eucharistic theology of Afanas′ev and the antinomies of Florensky were all synthesised into his interpretive approach. The divine-human and ecclesial principles, for which Men was especially reliant on these thinkers, played a particularly important role in his thinking, as it was these principles that related his biblical theology to his interpretive approach. Although Men infrequently uses the term, from his interest in the 'whole' it is clear that behind Men's approach to biblical interpretation lies Solov′ev's concept of 'all-unity' (*vseedinstvo*), which may be described as the organic unity of cosmic being and the mutual interrelatedness of its parts together with the preservation of their individuality. Due to their universalising and 'cosmic' implications, both the divine-human and ecclesial principles point us forward to a universal divine-human culture that stands at the eschatological end of the biblical narrative or 'biblical world', where all boundaries have been overcome and Solov′ev's 'all-unity' fully realised.

2.3) General Summary

Following our argument from his biography and works in Chapter One that Men might be usefully characterised as an interpreter of the Bible, in Chapter Two we have begun a discussion of what kind of interpreter he was. Can he be understood as a representative of 'Russian Orthodox Biblical Interpretation'? This question is problematised by competing accounts of what 'Russian Orthodox Biblical Interpretation' might be. For some, such as Vladimir Volgin, the only permissible interpretations are those provided by the Fathers of the Church. In this case Men is to be assessed according to his citations of these Fathers and how closely his own exegesis remains aligned to theirs. This is not as straightforward as it seems, because 'Russian Orthodox' interpretation, even Patristic interpretation, is a moving target. Notions of authority cannot remain statically dependent on the perceived sacredness of certain texts and their authors, as such an approach fails to give a methodology for approaching the Church's body of exegetical material. The alternative, provided by Men, and a few others, such as Negrov, is to provide a historical account of the development of Russian Orthodox Biblical Interpretation, alongside a descriptive account of its principles. Men differs from Negrov in first of all seeing the 'Russian school' writers as a legitimate development of the interpretive tradition with respect to its history, and second in closely reflecting their 'biblical theologies' in his hermeneutical principles. In most other ways, Negrov follows Men rather closely. Both historical accounts show that 'Russian Orthodox biblical interpretation' was never the static entity that Volgin seems to describe.

Neither Volgin nor Men nor Bogdashevskii (of whom Negrov provides a detailed study) may be characterised as an archetypal 'Russian Orthodox Bible Interpreter' as no such person exists. Therefore we must mark out new paths, and these are most obviously provided by

Men himself. While it may seem worryingly circular in the context of the present study to rely on Men to provide his own definition of 'Russian Orthodox Biblical Interpretation', we are forced to accept that very few others have made any attempt to assess the nature of this discipline. Those that have tend to be largely dependent on Men's writings. Men's extensive and detailed accounts of the discipline, especially in his *Dictionary* remain unparalleled in Orthodox writing and they stand before the reader as a huge body of material that may be engaged with or rejected as the reader chooses. In this sense, Russian Orthodox thinking on biblical interpretation stands at a crossroads.

2.1.3 looked at Men's views on divine inspiration, biblical unity, isagogics and hermeneutics. Through these 'descriptive' accounts, we recognised that not all is quite as straightforward as it seems. 'Russian school' thought is everywhere in evidence. The question of biblical unity is closely linked to how Men understands the divine inspiration of Scripture, and Solov′ev's 'biblical theology', based on the notion of 'all-unity' and a reworking of the notion of 'ecclesiality', provides a valuable resource for Men in explicating the matter. Men accepts the new isagogics of 'biblical science', as earlier accepted by 'Russian school' author Kartashev, since he believes this criticism may legitimately be applied to the historical, conditional and human side of Scripture. Thus Men's approach to hermeneutics seeks to reconcile a historically informed biblical theology with what it might mean for believers now, which was also a principle concern of such figures as Solov′ev, Sergei Trubetskoi, and Bulgakov. Thus exegesis and theology are irretrievably intertwined.

This chapter began by citing Yonatan Moss on the disparity between theological exclusivity and exegetical inclusivity in the Eastern Orthodox tradition. It is quite clear from discussions of 2.1.3 that in Men's use of 'Russian school' biblical interpretation there can no longer be

such a sharp delineation between the two. Men's four principles of 'Russian Orthodox biblical interpretation' demonstrate this with still greater clarity. His explications of the divine-human and ecclesial principles, when taken together, present us with a strongly universalising account of biblical revelation that incorporates a multitude of interpretive voices, although it is nonetheless oriented on the Person of Christ and the Eucharist. The ecclesial principle aims to progressively transfigure the whole of human society, such that it becomes what the Bible represents with the image of the millennial kingdom. In this process, the secular sphere and other religions present themselves as conditioned realities with relative value. They await transformation into the fullness of divine-human culture through encounter with the Person of Christ.

3) Aleksandr Men's Biblical Theology in Light of the Philosophical and Theological Thought of Sergei Trubetskoi (1862-1905)

It is clear from the first two chapters of this study that the writers of the 'Russian school' have had a major impact on Men's exegetical thinking, as well as the development of his 'biblical theology'. Generally it has been acknowledged that the primary position among these should be allocated to Vladimir Solov′ev, and indeed, there is good reason for this, as acknowledged in 2.1.3 and 2.2.2. In answer to the question "Which theologians and writers had the greatest influence on you?" Men himself stated the following in his *Interview in Case of Arrest.*

> In the first place I should name Vladimir Solov′ev. Although I did not agree with many of his viewpoints he was my true teacher. And only after him I studied the works of the representatives of of Russian religious philosophy. For much I am indebted to Berdyaev, Florensky, Bulgakov, Frank, Lossky and others.[434]

The importance of Solov′ev's thinking for Men's six-volume *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life* is hard to underestimate,[435] serving as its inspiration, template, and influencing many of its most important concepts. Predein comments, justifiably, that Men cites Solov′ev "as a historian of religion, and as a biblical scholar, and as a religious philosopher, and as a spiritual writer and as a poet". He then continues with an even stronger claim. "Perhaps even more important is the fact that in the writing of Fr. Aleksandr we encounter ideas taken from Solov′ev, but assimilated so long ago and deeply that they are reproduced without any citation of the original source."[436] According to Paul Valliere, "Men's legacy is huge, and it will take years to sort it out; but there is no doubt about the Solovievian roots of his

[434] Мень А.прот. О себе..., 214.
[435] Daniel, Wallace, *Russia's Uncommon Prophet,* 172-174.
[436] Предеин Д.прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как выдающийся православный катехизатор... 99.

intellectuality. His was a mature Solovievianism, certainly, enriched by an erudite biblicism and decades of experience as a parish priest…. If the case of Bulgakov as we have presented it does not suffice to prove the deep compatibility of Soloviev's philosophy with Orthodox faith, Father Aleksandr Men may be cited as a second and, one hopes, decisive example."[437]

In this respect it would be wise to trace the influence of Solov′ev on Men's biblical thought with some caution. Solov′ev's close friend, confidante and to some extent, student, Sergei Trubetskoi (1862-1905), was of still greater significance for Aleksandr Men's interpretive approach and specifically in his combination of philosophy, biblical interpretation and the Orthodox faith. This becomes increasingly evident in the works of Men's third and fourth periods, which, incidentally, date from after his *Interview in Case of Arrest.* Men devoted the most substantial article in his *Dictionary* concerned with any single theological thinker to Sergei Trubetskoi,[438] and claimed in his lecture on the Trubetskoi brothers that Sergei

> showed how naturally and organically a courageous critical viewpoint could be combined with the deepest penetration into the meaning of the biblical narrative and doctrine. If I was asked who best of all set out the foundations of biblical theology, I would say that in the Russian language, to date there has been no one greater than Sergei Nikolaevich Trubetskoi.[439]

Men believed that Trubetskoi "preempted many ideas of contemporary Western exegetes".[440] The influence of Trubetskoi on Men's thinking has not gone unnoticed. Daniel devotes a short section of his book to the 'Trubetskoi brothers',[441] largely concerning himself with Sergei's social significance rather than his thought, while Valentina Kuznetsova and Pavel Men list Sergei Trubetskoi alongside Vladimir Solov′ev, Sergei Bulgakov and Anton Kartashev as one of the most influential figures for Men's approach specifically to biblical

---

[437] Valliere, Paul, *Modern Russian Theology,* 402.
[438] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том третий. 267-274.
[439] Мень А.прот. Русская религиозная философия, 84.
[440] Мень А.прот. К истории... 373.
[441] Daniel, Wallace, *Russia's Uncommon Prophet,* 258-262.

thought in their *Foreword* to *How to Read the Bible.*[442] The nature of Trubetskoi's influence on Men's biblical thought has not so far been subjected to more detailed analysis, however. Thus, in the course of this chapter it will be necessary to show how Men drew on Trubetskoi's combination of critical thinking, biblical theology and philosophy. Given that Sergei Trubetskoi is a little known figure, it will be imperative in 3.1 to discuss how Trubetskoi as a philosopher-theologian and social activist might be characterised. 3.2 will discuss Men's engagement with the thought of Adolf von Harnack, and 3.3 looks at Trubetskoi's formation of response to Harnack's *History of Dogma* in his letters to the latter. This was a work much studied by Men in his student years[443] and the inclusion of these previously unpublished letters as Annex Two in the present study will help us understand Trubetskoi's relevance to Men. These three sections serve as a preliminary for 3.4, which will give an overview of Men's engagement with Trubetskoi's biblical theology and interpretation. 3.5 will consider how Men's response to Bulgakov's sophiology follows the 'logological' reworking of Solov′ev's 'all-unity' (*vseedinstvo*) set out in Trubetskoi's writing, before looking at Men's response to Trubetskoi's own concrete idealist philosophical conceptions. 3.6 will draw on the biblical thought of both Sergei Trubetskoi and Sergei Bulgakov, who was to some extent developing the thought of Trubetskoi, to explicate Men's 'symbolic' and 'metahistorical' exegesis of Genesis 1-3 and Revelation.

It will be argued that the type of approach taken by Men to biblical exegesis finds its roots in the engagement between Adolf von Harnack and Sergei Trubetskoi. In Trubetskoi's writings we see a respect for critical scientific study of the Bible, an interest in explicating the continuity between Old and New Testaments, a 'logological' interpretation of the Bible and world history that supplants sophiology with a more concentrated christocentricity, and an

[442] Кузнецова В.Н., Мень П.В. Предисловие. - Мень А.прот. Как читать библию. Часть первая, 13.
[443] Мень А.прот. О себе..., 67; Масленикова З.А. Жизнь отца Александра Меня, 113.

emphasis on symbolism and imagery in biblical interpretation. From charting the course of Men's interaction with Trubetskoi, we therefore see that he stands in a 'biblical' tradition of Russian Orthodoxy that is presently little known and little studied.

3.1) Characterising Sergei Trubetskoi's Thought

Although Trubetskoi's most significant works come from the period 1890-1900,[444] the biographical works dedicated to his life tend to concern themselves far more with the final period of his life, leading up to his death in 1905. Thus his campaigns for social reform and intellectual freedoms leading up to the 1905 revolution and his short rectorship of Moscow University in its aftermath in 1905, are treated in detail by Bohachevsky-Chomiak in chapters three to seven of her book,[445] and it is his social significance that is primarily accentuated in the memoirs of his sister, Olga Trubetskaya.[446] The inference from these studies seems to be that Sergei Trubetskoi's interests in academia were instrumental and served the purposes of practical societal change. His use of Greek philosophy can be read as an indirect criticism of modern philosophy and theology, his response to Harnack's *History of Dogma* as an attempt to establish a fledgling 'scientific' approach to biblical studies within Orthodoxy and his own idealistic philosophy as a basis both for Russian conceptions of self-identity and the development of a creative hermeneutic. All of these things serve a Solov′evian conception of 'all-unity' (*vseedinstvo*), which in turn demands social equality and new freedoms. Bulgakov, in his 'tribute' to Trubetskoi, chooses to emphasise the significance of his philosophical

[444] 1) Metaphysics in Ancient Greece (1890), 2) On the Nature of Human Consciousness (1890), 3) Foundations of Idealism (1896), 4) Teaching of the Logos in its History (1900). In Russian: 1) Трубецкой С.кн. Метафизика въ Древней Греціи. М.: Тип. Э. Лисснера и Ю. Романа, 1890, Трубецкой С.Н. Собрание сочинений Кн. Сергея Николаевича Трубецкого. Том III. М.: Тип. Г. Лисснера и Д. Собко, 1910.; 2) Трубецкой С.Н. О природе человеческого сознания. - Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994, 483-593; 3) Трубецкой С.Н. Основания идеализма. - Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994, 594-717; 4) Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе в его истории. - Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994, 43-482.

[445] Bohachevsky-Chomiak, Martha, *Sergei N. Trubetskoi: An Intellectual Among the Intelligentsia in Prerevolutionary Russia,* (Belmont, Mass.: Nordland Publishing Company, 1976).

[446] Трубецкая О.кн.. Княз С.Н. Трубецкой (Воспоминание сестры). Нью-Йорк: Издательство имени Чехова, 1953.

works as the foundation of his other writings and social action,[447] although he admits that Trubetskoi's work has the most 'scientific' character of all Russian religious philosophers. Furthermore, his use of the 'concrete idealism' set out in Trubetskoi's *Foundations of Idealism* is a strong feature of Bulgakov's early work *Philosophy of Economy*,[448] which is an incisive critique both of the status quo and Marxist political economy.

It is neither the social significance of Trubetskoi's biography nor even his philosophical views that Men chooses to take for the starting point of his assessment of Sergei Trubetskoi in his lecture on the Trubetskoi brothers. At the outset, it should be noted that Men's lecture on the Trubetskoi brothers is essentially a lecture on Sergei, with only a short appendix dedicated to his more famous brother Evgenii. He begins with a short biographical introduction, where he notes both Trubetskoi's childhood in an aristocratic and deeply intellectual atmosphere of love for music, poetry and tradition and Trubetskoi's close connection with Vladimir Solov′ev, who "died in his arms" in 1900.[449]

Men then continues with an extensive discussion of Sergei Trubetskoi's relationship with Adolf von Harnack, and his response to Harnack's thought. Trubetskoi attended Harnack's lectures in Berlin in 1890 after completing his *Metaphysics in Ancient Greece* and took from Harnack a firm belief in the significance of New Testament criticism and the historical value of the creation of a strict, unsparingly critical scientific methodology.[450] Men said the following in one of his lectures.

Very often in ecclesial circles, Orthodox and Catholic, many either have feared scientific criticism,

[447] Булгаков С.Н. Философия кн. С.Н. Трубецкого и духовная борьба современности (рецензия). "Вопросы Философии и Психологии", 1909. Вып.1, январь: http://ivashek.com/ru/texts/philosophy-texts/802-filosofiya-kn-s-n-trubetskogo-i-dukhovnaya-borba-sovremennosti-retsenziya [Accessed 04/10/2018].
[448] Булгаков С.Н. Философия хозяйства. М.: ТЕРРА-Книжный клуб, 2008.
[449] Мень А.прот. Русская религиозная философия, 71.
[450] Мень А.прот. Русская религиозная философия, 72.

criticism of the text, studies concerned with how some work of the Old or New Testament came to be, studies concerned with the authenticity of lives of the saints or ecclesial histories, or, when in the end this conservatism turned out to be untenable, threw themselves towards the opposite extreme.[451]

Thus Harnack and Trubetskoi are both of great value to Men in charting a course between the Scylla of uncritical 'hyperconservatism' and the Charybdis of 'hypercriticism'. While Men acknowledges that Harnack recognised the importance of the search for eternal Christian values alongside criticism, he notes that Trubetskoi and Harnack had serious disagreements. Trubetskoi criticised Harnack's appropriation of Kant, his attempts to separate the knowing subject from the real object, and believed that this led Harnack to an unfounded adogmatism and rejection of metaphysics.

Men then continues in such a way that it is difficult to distinguish where he is expressing his own views on Harnack and where he is expressing those of Trubetskoi.

Later, in the winter of 1899-1900, Harnack read for students a cycle of lectures in Berlin University, named "The Meaning of Christianity".... In this the scientist expressed his Credo. This book, however, brilliant in form and content, turned out to be incapable of expressing the meaning of Christianity. For Harnack could not escape from the gnoseological prison into which neokantian skepticism had thrown him. From this we have a play of words, since for Harnack, those things, which we come to know by a mysterious or intuitive path, as though disappear; he understood that science does not know and cannot know the answer to why we exist and why the world and human beings exist. Nonetheless, he sought meaning in historical facts, and this was in itself flawed. For the meaning of any phenomenon is known by intuitive contemplation. History only gives a set of facts.[452]

In placing Trubetskoi's relationship with Harnack at the centre of his assessment, Men was certainly unusual. Where it is mentioned in other commentaries, it is usually only in passing. Bohachevsky-Chomiak, Trubetskaya and Bulgakov do not mention it, and Zenkovsky only briefly refers to this relationship which "undoubtedly influenced him" in his *A History of Russian Philosophy.*[453] This aspect of Men's assessment of Trubetskoi demands detailed

[451] Мень А.прот. Русская религиозная философия, 73.
[452] Мень А.прот. Русская религиозная философия, 75-76.
[453] Zenkovsky, Vasilii Vasil′evich *A History of Russian Philosophy, Volume Two,* translated George Kline. (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1953), 793.

consideration.

3.2) Aleksandr Men's Reading of Adolf von Harnack's Biblical Thought

To understand Men's account of Trubetskoi's thinking and use of it, it will be imperative to first of all think about the significance of Harnack for Men's theological development.

Maslenikova records that Men read Harnack's *History of Dogma* in 1953, shortly before finishing secondary school.[454] Daniel's claim that "Men read the first volume of Harnack's multivolume *History of Dogma*"[455] appears to be an error, not least because none of the multivolume editions of Harnack's work (in German *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*) have ever been published in Russian translation. Thus it seems more likely that Men had encountered and perused the 1911 Russian-language version of the one-volume *Grundriss der Dogmengeschichte* of 1889 (third edition 1898), published ambiguously in Russian as *Istoriya dogmatov (History of Dogma)*.[456] Nonetheless, if Men had seriously studied this condensed version and found it valuable at the age of eighteen, it would be sensible to conclude that it had an impact on how he later formulated his approach to the theological question of biblical interpretation.

Indeed, from time to time, we see this in his 'works'. The first mention of Harnack in Men's published work comes in the 1968 edition of *Son of Man,* in which he drew on Harnack's lecture series *The Meaning of Christianity,* published in Russian as *Sushchnost' khristianstva* in 1907,[457] to expound Harnack's views on the historical Jesus. In this work Men saw

[454] Масленикова З.А. Жизнь отца Александра Меня, 112.
[455] Daniel, Wallace, *Russia's Uncommon Prophet,* 352n.25.
[456] Гарнак, Адолф фон. История догматов – Общая история европейской культуры. СПб., 1911. Т.6. Harnack, Adolf von, *Outlines of the History of Dogma,* (New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1893). The English edition is a translation of an earlier edition of this work.
[457] Гарнак, Адолф фон. Сущность христианства, М., 1907.

parallels with Lev Tolstoy's christological views.

> Jesus existed. He embodied in Himself the ideal of perfect faith and was a teacher of great ethical stature. Those who have incorporated His experience and His teaching are genuine Christians, but they should reject the idea of divine-humanity [*bogochelovechestvo*] and other 'dogmatic sophistications'.[458]

Men was strongly critical of Lev Tolstoy's theological conceptions as is clear from a reading of his *Dictionary* article on the great writer and religious thinker,[459] even though he wrote and spoke about him at length, perhaps for apologetic reasons.[460] Despite what he considered to be similarities between the two, Men was more measured in his critique of Harnack. Harnack believed, after all, that Jesus was "a unique Human leading people to God, whereas Tolstoy set Him on the same level as other teachers".[461] When it came to the miraculous aspects of the Gospel accounts, Men also sympathised with Harnack. Even if Harnack did not believe in miracles, he believed that much in the world was "miraculous" and "inexplicable",[462] possibly including the healings performed by Jesus. In *Son of Man,* Men claims, somewhat unconvincingly, that Harnack's views on miracles were similar to those of Augustine, who stated "miracles are not contrary to nature but only contrary to what we know about nature".[463] Men, however, agreed with Harnack, rather than Augustine, concerning the qualitative distinction between Old Testament and New Testament miracles. If Augustine used his famous statement in support of the objective veracity of Joshua 10:12-14, in which the sun stood still for a whole day, this was emphatically denied by both Harnack and Men, who saw the account as a "poetic reflection" of "supernatural help".[464]

---

458 Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий, 374.
459 Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том третий. 251-256.
460 'The Religious-Philosophical Views of Lev Tolstoy' (lecture), Мень А.прот. Русская религиозная философия. 102-141, 'The Tragedy of a Genius' (article): Мень А.прот. Трудный путь к диалогу.
461 Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий, 374.
462 Men bases his claims on Harnack's fairly extensive discussion of miracles in Lecture II of *The Meaning of Christianity:* http://www.ccel.org/ccel/harnack/christianity.iii.ii.html [Accessed 01/11/2018].
463 Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий, 375. Augustine of Hippo, *City of God* XXI.8.2, http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/120121.htm [Accessed 01/11/2018].
464 Brussels Bible commentary on Joshua 10:12-14.

Men's principal critique of Harnack in *Son of Man* is the same as that, which he later attributed to Trubetskoi in his lecture on the latter (3.1). Harnack was led by a priori philosophical principles, rather than 'science' as such, resulting in adogmatism.

> Liberal theologians wanted to identify the good news of Christ with their conception of 'pure religion'; while further study of the Gospels showed that the 'historical Jesus' is inseparable from the One who revealed Himself in the experience of the first Christians as 'God-man' [*bogochelovek*] and Saviour.[465]

Thus, Men's critique of Harnack is logically connected with his defence of divine-humanity as a christological principle, which, as we discussed in 2.2.2, is (in Russian, at least) a nineteenth-century neologism describing Solov′ev's metaphysical interpretation of the Chalcedonian dogma. Men's interpretation of biblical history has a divine-human core to it, and he draws close to Trubetskoi's development of this Solov′evian idea. Trubetskoi relates Solov′ev's thinking to Schleiermacherian terminology by seeing the 'God-consciousness' of the prophets as an essential foundation for understanding the historical dimension of the divine-humanity.[466]

Men developed his assessment of Harnack in much greater detail in his *Dictionary* in the 1980s,[467] now using not only *The Meaning of Christianity,* but the *History of Dogma* too. This is the most substantial article in the *Dictionary* on a Protestant theologian, which in itself demonstrates Harnack's significance for Men.

He begins by stating the foundational question for Harnack's theological thought. "What should be considered the starting point of Christianity?" The answer "Jesus Christ and His

[465] Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий, 375.
[466] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе, 342.
[467] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый. 231-236, 232.

Gospel" is to be qualified by much historical analysis that leads Harnack away from the traditional interpretations of both Jesus Christ and His Gospel. Due to his 'neo-Kantian' assumptions (presumably these involve a 'scientific' interpretation of Kant that downplays the role of intuition, although the term is not subjected to analysis by Men[468]), Harnack could not claim that Christ was a revelation of God, nor the 'God-man', since science can know nothing about these things, but merely the greatest of humans, who experienced deeper than anyone the calling of 'divine sonship'. Likewise, the resurrection gained its significance not from whether or not the miracle of revived human flesh actually took place, since science has nothing to tell us about this, but from its indisputable role as the "source of unfailing faith in victory over death and eternal life".[469] This 'pure Christianity' was the result of the highly unusual action of the Person of Christ on His disciples. Men reacts with some cynicism to Harnack's claim that he had developed his notion of 'pure Christianity' from historical study alone.

At the same time historical investigations are never absolutely objective. Facts obtained by the historian are inescapably interpreted by him/her. Harnack interpreted them in the light of the philosophy of liberal Protestantism, as shown by his *History of Dogma*. In it he portrayed the development of ecclesial and dogmatic Christianity as the history of a lengthy degeneration. The Gnostics began a "rapid Hellenization" of the Gospel that culminated in a doctrinal metaphysic alien to the teaching of Christ, and the Judaeo-Latin spirit turned the Church into an organised institution. Only German Protestantism could return to the Gospel. But in the eyes of Harnack even Luther turned out to be overly timid. He wrote, "it is necessary to preserve and continue what he started", in other words "free" the Gospel from layers of sediment, basically cross out the two-thousand-year experience of the Church and obtain "simple faith", faith in "the God, who Jesus Christ called His Father and who is our Father". There is a clear element of truth in Harnack's conception: ecclesial history contains not only the highest Christian experience, but the lamentable inheritance of centuries when connection with the Gospel was not infrequently lost. According to the Gospel, however, the Church is a tree growing from a seed, and it would hardly be right to try to turn it back into a seed. Harnack is correct to show the importance of the ethical aspect of the Gospel, but he reduces to a worthless minimum its mystical content, while at the same negating the legality of its theologising and contemplating mind. This is why when speaking of the "meaning" of Christianity Harnack is forced to interpret the facts of history.[470]

[468] Heis, Jeremy, 'Neo-Kantianism', *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2018 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.) at https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2018/entries/neo-kantianism/ [Accessed 18/04/2019].
[469] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый. 233.
[470] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый. 233.

As Men claims elsewhere, Harnack's philosophical rejection of Kant's metaphysical 'thing-in-itself' in favour of historical scientific method leads him to emphasise simplification and purity, alongside a rejection of mysticism; the Gospel should be brought into line with these philosophical presumptions. At the same time, historical science could not ultimately be mobilised in support of Harnack's belief in the uniqueness of Christ. Therefore, Men concludes that Harnack's account of the "meaning" of Christianity is actually a matter of faith, not science; its scientific appearance is sophistic illusion. Indeed, the distinction between interpretive methodology and biblical theology is blurred without acknowledgment. Intriguingly, this leads Men to speak positively of Barth's position in his polemic with Harnack, since Barth speaks with clarity on these matters. The Bible cannot be understood only through historical investigation. The Word of God can only be understood in all its depth through faith awakened by God.[471] As has been noted,[472] Barth shared with Solov′ev, Men's 'true teacher', a common focus on the 'God-man' and His unequivocal demands.

Harnack's rejection of this Chalcedonian theological christocentrism led him to a somewhat problematic relationship with the Old Testament. While he rejected the idea that it should merely be seen as a conglomeration of myths, he did sympathise with Marcion,[473] and believed that the time had come for its canonical status to be rejected. As might be predicted from his interest in 'pure religion', he greatly preferred the prophets and Psalms to the institutions and regulations of the Second Temple Period, which he saw as the predecessors of the 'dogmatic' institutionalized Church. In this, as we can see from both his great passion for the message of the prophets and harsh criticism of Ezra's reforms in *Messengers of the*

[471] Men's article on Harnack refers to his article on Barth. Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый. 234,113.

[472] D. Stephen Long and Richard J. Barry IV, 'Symphonic Theology and the Cacophonous World: Barth and Solovyev on Political Theology', *Correlating Sobornost: Conversations between Karl Barth and the Russian Orthodox Tradition,* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2016), 241-272, 245.

[473] Harnack, Adolf von, *Marcion: das Evangelium vom fremden Gott,* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1921).

Kingdom of God,[474] Men followed Harnack closely. Nonetheless, Men did not wish to reject the canonical status of the Old Testament, primarily because his acceptance of the doctrine of divine-humanity led him to a christocentric, metaphysical interpretation of Old Testament history following Solov′ev and Trubetskoi. Men's understanding of the connection between the Old Testament community of faith and the New Testament Church was discussed above in 2.2.3. It was far easier for Men to agree with many of Harnack's views on the New Testament, although he recognised that some of these were outdated. He agreed with Harnack's rejection of F.C. Baur's late datings for the Gospels and epistles, for example;[475] Harnack believed that their simple form of expression demonstrated their lack of engagement with the Hellenic thinking that later infiltrated the Church. Men also valued Harnack's writing skill highly. He was particularly enthusiastic about Harnack's 'living' account of the missionary activities of Paul and the critical role of the development of the Pauline communities in the growth of the early Church.[476] In this way, it seems Men drew inspiration from Harnack when he came to write his own 'religious histories'.

We may justifiably state two things at this point. First Men, like Karl Barth, was deeply influenced by an early engagement with Harnack's *History of Dogma,* although the manner of this influence differed somewhat from that in the case of Barth. Men drew from Harnack's account of the early development of Christian thought his interpretive emphases, his creative use of critical analysis and his attempts to peel away the less positive layers of Christian history to reveal its core. He also found inspiration in Harnack's writing style and method. Most significantly in this respect, Men's recognition of the role of Harnack's neo-Kantian philosophical assumptions in his 'historical' account suggests an interrelationship between

[474] Мень А.прот. Вестники..., 442
[475] Men criticised Baur's 'rationalism' and 'Hegelianism' in his article on the theologian and biblical critic: Баур (1792-1860) in Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый. 115-116.
[476] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый. 235

interpretive method and biblical theology. Second Men, like Karl Barth, criticised Harnack strongly from a doctrinally christocentric position. Men, however, particularly concerned himself with Harnack's wholesale rejection of ecclesiastical dogma, as it left no room for a positive metaphysical account of both Old Testament interpretation and the interpretive role of the institutional Church. In this he was influenced by Solov′ev and had much in common with Averintsev (1.1.5), but Trubetskoi was of still greater significance. Their ascending account of religious history contrasted markedly with Harnack's account of an increasingly corrupted 'pure faith' and gave Men's own account its organic and developmental optimism.

3.3) Sergei Trubetskoi's Polemic with Adolf von Harnack

Sergei Trubetskoi developed his critique of Harnack's historical account of dogma during his studies with the German theologian in 1890-91[477] and the primary source material for this is Trubetskoi's correspondence with Harnack (1891-1894). It is unlikely that Men was acquainted with the relevant correspondence since it has never been published,[478] yet it will help us understand the appeal of Trubetskoi's later work *Teaching of the Logos in its History* (1900) to Men not simply on its own terms, but as a response to Harnack. This correspondence occupies a pivotal role in Trubetskoi's attempts to formulate his own biblical position, and as such sheds much light on the views expressed later.

In his 1895 article *Ethics and Dogmatics*,[479] Trubetskoi criticises Harnack's notion that

[477] Trubetskoi spent time in Berlin between November 1890 and March 1891: Ермишин О. Т. Княз С.Н. Трубецкой. Жизнь и философия: биография. М.: СИНАКСИС, 2011, 16-17. He attended Harnack's lectures, and became closely acquainted with the professor and his family. From his correspondence it is clear the two enjoyed a warm relationship, and that Trubetskoi valued his studies.

[478] Men knew of close relations between Harnack and Trubetskoi, especially Trubetskoi's introduction of Solov′ev's *History and Future of Theocracy* to Harnack (Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том третий. 139), but did not have access to the correspondence in Berlin. Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том третий. 267 refers to the 'friendship' between Harnack and Trubetskoi.

[479] Трубецкой С.Н. Этика и догматика. - Собрание сочинений Кн. Сергея Николаевича Трубецкого. Том II. М.: Тип. Г. Лисснера и Д. Собко, 1910, 139-168,160.

Christian dogma is the "work of the Hellenic spirit on the soil of the Gospel". According to Trubetskoi, the "madness" of enfleshment of the Logos and the Cross of Christ serve to dismiss such a theory. This solitary paragraph is not, however, sufficient material to explain the most interesting and developed aspects of the later *Teaching of the Logos*. When considered in the light of the questions that arose in Trubetskoi's letters to Harnack, it becomes clear that this extensive work, especially its second part, is a thorough outworking of the matters discussed in the earlier letters, even if explicit references to Harnack are infrequent.[480] This is confirmed by Gaidenko's comment. "S.N. Trubetskoi is to a significant degree indebted to interaction with [Harnack] in 1890-91 for his interest in the problem of the origins of Christianity, to which he dedicated his doctoral dissertation, *Teaching of the Logos in its History* (1900)".[481] Therefore, since Trubetskoi's *Teaching of the Logos* is of clear relevance to Men's formulation of a response to Harnack, turning to Trubetskoi's correspondence with Harnack will help us explain the sources and character of both Men's response and the significance of Trubetskoi for Men.[482]

By the time of this correspondence, despite the fact he was not yet 30, Trubetskoi was already well established as an academic in Russia. He had recently completed his substantial *Metaphysics in Ancient Greece* in 1890, which had provoked controversy in conservative circles (responses from Protopresbyter Butkevich and Archbishop Antonii Khrapovitskii are especially noteworthy) for seeing the seeds of Christianity in Ancient Greek thought.[483]

[480] Harnack's 'Hellenization thesis' is mentioned only a few times in *Teaching of the Logos*, generally in a critical light while discussing the connection between Jewish apocalyptic literature and early Christian Gnosticism. For example, Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 351-2, 400.

[481] Гайденко П.П. <Конкретный идеализм> С.Н. Трубецкого, 6.

[482] Since they have not previously been published, the four extant letters of Trubetskoi to Harnack are included in this study in French (Letters 1-3) and German (Letter 4) with English translations as Annex Two. Unfortunately, Harnack's responses to Trubetskoi are not extant. This correspondence is archived in Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, A.v. Harnack/ IIIA Nr. 236, but references will be to Annex 2 of this study.

[483] Мень А.прот. Русская религиозная философия. 82. Butkevich's critique also accused Trubetskoi of Hegelianism. Trubetskoi's response is: "Мнимое язычество или ложное христианство?", Трубецкой С.Н. Собрание сочинений Кн. Сергея Николаевича Трубецкого. Том II. М.: Тип. Г. Лисснера и Д. Собко, 1910, 166-189. In Метафизика древней Греции (33), Trubetskoi departs from Hegel by questioning his account of synthesis and its helpfulness: "In reality there is no pure synthesis, no pure analysis and no pure

Before turning to the letters themselves, it is worth briefly considering the views espoused in the *Introduction* to Trubetskoi's *Metaphysics in Ancient Greece,* written immediately before his period of study with Harnack. On the history of Christian dogma he writes the following.

> In antiquity metaphysics first rose up against pagan polytheism and preached one spiritual God with the sermon of a free mind. It prepared the whole of the enlightened humanity of the ancient world for the acceptance of the beginnings of Christianity and, inspired by the spirit of Christ, created Orthodox dogma, the Christian gnosis of the Holy Fathers. It developed this dogma into a well-shaped building and expressed in itself the rational and free consciousness of Christian truth. Later, when in German Europe this dogma, ossified in its ancient form, appeared external, an alien burden, it was metaphysics that first set minds free, sending them towards a self-regulated and free study of nature, spirit and religion.[484]

From this, two things should be noted. First, Trubetskoi gave a surprisingly positive account of the events leading up to the Reformation in Western Europe and even the Reformation itself. He saw it as a return to the free, dynamic metaphysical expression of the early Church. Trubetskoi was very open to incorporating aspects of Protestant methodologies in his own thought. Second, however, Trubetskoi interpreted the Reformation completely differently to Harnack. It was not an attempt to set the Church free from the metaphysics that undergirded its dogmatic conceptions, but a genuine metaphysical expression designed to revive the antiquated and ossified conceptions that had lost any connection with the metaphysics that originally inspired them. Trubetskoi came to Harnack with a positive understanding of the role of metaphysics in formulating Christian dogma, and therefore a positive understanding of the role of Greek philosophical thought.

The positive relation to metaphysics is very clear in the later *Teaching of the Logos,* although that work does not discuss the Reformation. Its first part is concerned with the Logos as

---

indifference." The accusation of Hellenism left its residue in Florovsky's characterisation of the philosopher: Florovsky, Georges *Introduction*, Martha Bohachievsky-Chomiak, *S.N. Trubetskoi: An Intellectual among the intelligentsia in Prerevolutionary Russia,* 5-10. Trubetskoi was apparently a "Hellene who recognized and accepted Christ", "an old Russian liberal who remained a Westerner despite the many Slavophile motifs which he brought into his thought", whose "books and... publicistic articles now seem a bit dated".

[484] Трубецкой С.Н. Метафизика в древней Греции. 30-31.

presented in Hellenic thought. The second considers how Old Testament thought prepares the way for Jesus Christ and Christianity, giving the most significant role to the Gospel of John, which in itself is remarkable for the period.[485] The Johannine Logos itself provides a bridge between the two. According to Gaidenko, this sets up a predominantly Protestant problematic that, by its critical analysis of the Logos, admits the possibility of distortion of the Evangelical faith.[486] Thus it could be said that Trubetskoi, through his methodology, is importing 'Protestantizing' tendencies into his own Orthodox faith, albeit assimilated to a Solov′evian philosophical-hermeneutical structure. This does not make him a crypto-Protestant, however. His defences of John's Gospel and Christian dogma against Harnack come from an Orthodox atmosphere. Gaidenko summarises how in the monotheistic and rational metaphysical criticism of pagan polytheism

> ...points of contact are shown between the "mind" of Greek thinkers and the faith of Christian prophets and Christian theology is to be received as the result of a meeting between two different, but convergent, traditions, and not as the extraneous vaccination of Christian theology by Greek naturalism, as Harnack suggested.[487]

For Men, Trubetskoi and Solov′ev, in fact, it is the convergence of the philosophical conceptions of the Greeks and especially the prophecy of the Old Testament that lead the human spirit through the idea of the Kingdom of God to the idea of 'divine-humanity'.

Turning to Trubetskoi's letters to Harnack, we might therefore expect some polemical discourse, especially concerning their highly contrasted views on the origin of dogma, and we are not to be disappointed. The first two are the most substantial letters and are of greatest interest.

---

[485] Schweitzer, writing in 1906, for example, criticises Schleiermacher's "one-sided preference for the Fourth Gospel" which is "fatal to a sound historical view": Schweitzer, Albert, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus,* second ed., translated W. Montgomery, (New York: Dover, 2005), 66.

[486] Гайденко П.П. «Конкретный идеализм» С.Н. Трубецкого. 11.

[487] Гайденко П.П. «Конкретный идеализм» С.Н. Трубецкого. 12.

The first letter speaks of Harnack's reliance on neo-Kantian philosophy, which, as we have discussed, Men draws attention to in his lecture. Initially, at least, Trubetskoi is not wholly negative in his assessment of this philosophy, attempting to see in it the kind of positive metaphysical reflection he attributed to the Fathers and the Reformers in *Metaphysics*. It is a development of "the fundamental principles of the reform, of its subjective idealism",[488] and finds its reflection in the neo-Platonism of the 'anti-Gnostic Fathers'.

Nonetheless, the differences start to become clear. Where Harnack sees the development of dogma in terms of the imbibing of a 'Hellenic spirit' into the 'pure faith of the Gospels',[489] Trubetskoi accuses the 'Ritschlian' theological account of the sin and evil of fundamentally misunderstanding the Reformation.[490] In it there is no place for a sufficiently radical doctrine of the Fall, which has implications for how faith is understood. In contrast with the original spirit of the Reformation, Ritschl's combination of neo-Kantianism and the 'historicism' of the Tübingen school led to an "absolutely empirical and nominalist" conception of sin, which became an "essential point" in his subjective understanding of redemption.

> ...Luther has made *sola fides* a criterion of religion and not nominalism.... Faith lives from God and from the other world, it feeds on the "heavenly bread";[491] it is transcendent because it goes beyond the world. A theory of knowledge has little to teach it, and no memory can shake it, for it contains in itself a truly sure and divine science. It embraces God and man, it understands forgiveness and sin.[492]

The understanding of redemption that comes from a true faith is therefore objective. Harnack's school of theological thought has replaced true faith, which has its own metaphysical conceptions, with sterile neo-Kantian philosophy; for this reason it cannot

---

488 Annex 2:1.2.
489 For example, Harnack, Adolf von, *Outlines of the History of Dogma*, 14.
490 of which Harnack is a leading exponent.
491 John 6:50-51.
492 Annex 2:1.6.

understand the nature of sin, evil and redemption other than in subjective terms.[493]

The central theological (as opposed to philosophical) point of the dispute now becomes clear. Harnack and Trubetskoi have contrasted christological accounts, with Trubetskoi's account having much in common with that of Men. For Trubetskoi, the essential prerequisite for understanding redemption is faith in "the sacrifice of the God-man", which is a mystery the worship of which Trubetskoi describes as "one of the dearest and most touching pledges of persistent Christian unity in the division."[494] He anticipates Men's critique of Harnack here in two ways. First of all, for Men, the theological and metaphysical understanding of Jesus Christ as the 'God-man' is essential, and in no small measure because it enables the construction of the divine-human metaphysical principle with ecclesial, cultural and cosmic implications (2.2.2). For this reason, Men is able to give an 'ascending' or 'developmental' account of human spiritual history that contrasts with Harnack's descending account of the gradual corruption of the 'pure faith'. Second, for Men, as for Trubetskoi, the mystery of the Eucharist is at the centre of ecclesial unity (2.2.3), since it expresses the ongoing reality of the Incarnation. Harnack, in contrast, subjected the Eucharist to a 'historical' account, connecting its later role with an "immoral and irreligious thirst after 'realities'".[495]

Trubetskoi continues his christological account with a discussion of the Cross of Christ, which he sees primarily as the ultimate theodicy, in which "the eternal Father manifested all his righteousness and all the depth of his mercy in his beloved Son, who descended into the abyss of sin, took reprobation upon Himself, became a curse for us and has baptised us the children of sin as children of God".[496] Trubetskoi, like Harnack, rejects the idea that the Cross

[493] Annex 2:1.8.
[494] Annex 2:1.7.
[495] Harnack, Adolf von, *Outlines of the History of Dogma*, 312.
[496] Annex 2:1.8. Trubetskoi refers here to Matthew 27:46 and Mark 15:34.

is “a legal satisfaction” or “a debt paid for men to God or the prince of evil” or “even a deliverance from the sorrows, the tortures of men”. It is, however, “a manifestation of absolutely divine love, infinitely superior to sin, to evil, to hell”, meaning that “if evil persists, it is absolutely defeated, surpassed and judged”.[497] The Cross has objective theological redemptive significance; it is “the symbol of our complete redemption, our adoption, sanctification, the conquest of the world, and finally of all our faith”.[498] This stands comparison with Men’s account of the Cross in his *Son of Man.* “This method of execution becomes the symbol of Redemption, the symbol of the sacrificial love of God for fallen humanity”[499] and “as the Messiah-Redeemer, He voluntarily gave Himself into the power of the destructive elements and Divine-human power triumphed over them”.[500] There are differences between Trubetskoi and Men, however. Although equally uninterested in legal approaches to redemption, Men is happier than Trubetskoi to speak of the Cross as a ‘ransom’ (*vykup*) that sets sinners free from the power of Satan.[501] He also has greater interest in relating the sacrificial imagery of the Old Testament to the Last Supper and the Cross of Christ.[502] Trubetskoi discusses the sacrificial nature of the Cross only briefly in his *Teaching of the Logos.* “This death is the judgment and judging of the world that is unable to accept the Kingdom of God, and together it is the redemption of the world.... the suffering of the Son of God is the condemnation of the world, and together it is a sacrifice for the world, a redemption of the world from judgment.”[503] Neither Men nor Trubetskoi approach the

[497] Annex 2:1.9.
[498] Annex 2:1.9.
[499] Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий, 289.
[500] Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий, 303.
[501] Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие 519-520: “Christ speaks of his ministry to people as a battle with Satan, with ‘the prince of the world’ (John 12: 31, 14: 30, 16:11). Does not this name itself demonstrate that Satan truly took control of the human race, which turned into the kingdom of the devil rather than the Kingdom of God? ‘The power of darkness’ Christ sees in sin, illness, possession and in death (John 6:70, 13:2; Luke 8:28, 13:16, 22:31). Therefore in treating the soul and the body, He speaks about that, which sets forward the beginning of the general redemption from Satan, who is thrown down from his throne (Luke 10:18). The meaning of Christ’s meaning is not as an abstract ethical sermon, but freedom of the world from the power of Satan and sin.”
[502] Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий. 248-256
[503] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 474.

scriptural account of the Cross from a Western 'Anselmian' perspective. The talk of 'symbol' in the works of both is more reminiscent of the *Corpus Dionysiacum*[504] reflecting on the Eucharistic mystery[505] than Anselm's 'juridical' account. Nonetheless, their emphasis on the objective redemptive, theological significance of the Cross contrasts with Harnack's purely 'ethical' and 'incarnational' account of redemption.[506]

In his reply to Trubetskoi's first letter, it appears that Harnack had subjected Trubetskoi's use of the term 'faith' to some degree of criticism. In what sense can this be seen as a viable alternative to scientific methodology? In his second letter to Harnack, Trubetskoi therefore seeks to clarify the nature of the 'faith'.

> I cannot really understand that it is necessary to be a saint, a Gnostic, a prophet – a virtuoso in some way – to believe in the eternal divinity of Jesus, his incarnation, his objective redemption. I know that hundreds of Christian generations, as well as our millions of muzhiks – the most humble Christians who exist – have held this faith, which was expressed in mystical images – more naïve and inadequate than our dogmatic abstractions – but effective, alive and true to Christ. You tell me that I am talking to you about the sovereignty of ancient dogma. But redemption as I understand it, Christ, the cross, are not dogmas for me: it is faith, the Gospel. And we are more inclined to believe in images than in dogmas![507]

For Trubetskoi faith cannot finally be determined by concepts or any kind of metaphysical categories, although the dogmas of the Church have a secondary role in expressing the content of that faith. It has its fundamental nature beyond the sphere in which analysis may operate, and Trubetskoi will later attempt to develop an alternative philosophical approach that takes this into account (3.5.2). Faith is in fact open to anyone, not only those who have

---

[504] For example *Divine Names* 1.4 (592). The standard Greek edition is *Corpus Dionsiacum* 2 vols ed. Beate Regina Suchla, (Berlin:de Gruyter, 1990), vol 1. English-language: *Pseudo-Dionysius: the complete works,* trans. Colm Luibhéid, (New York: Paulist, 1987), 52-4.

[505] Men and Trubetskoi, following these Patristic writers, believed the Eucharist to be a continuation of the reality of the Cross, a viewpoint heavily criticised by Harnack: Harnack, Adolf von, *Outlines of the History of Dogma,* 305-312.

[506] Harnack, Adolf von, *Outlines of the History of Dogma* 240-241. In the Patristic era, "the death on the cross remained in particular unintelligible" (240). Combining this with his critique of Anselm, 427-432, we gain a better picture of his critical relation to redemptive theories based on the event of the death of Christ.

[507] Annex 2:2.4.

the analytical facilities to uncover the truth from underneath the sediment of 'ancient dogma'. This does not mean that scientific analysis is unnecessary; it just has no more claim to 'sovereignty' than the ancient dogma it seeks to criticise. "Without despising reason and science, I think they are always limited and that one does not need to be a philosopher or historian to have the right to call oneself a Christian", claims Trubetskoi.[508] For the ordinary Russian, the 'image' is of central importance and helps to see and understand faith for what it is.[509] Considering the problem of faith in the light of art and aesthetics provides a productive alternative to grasping it through theology and philosophy.[510] The concept of the ikon, for example, considered at length both by Sergei Trubetskoi's brother Evgenii[511] and later by Men gives vitality to the Christian faith that philosophy cannot offer. Here Men's claim that Harnack's *The Meaning of Christianity* was unable to express the meaning of Christianity (3.1.1) is pertinent. In his reliance on neo-Kantian 'dogma', Harnack rejected the living reality of the scriptural texts in their ecclesial expression. In replacing the conception of 'dogma' with 'image' Trubetskoi reversed this, not only making room for a discussion of the role of ikons, but ultimately for 'Russian school' views on the role of aesthetics in Christianity[512] and Men's interest in expressing the Christian faith through a great variety of different art forms (Chapter Four).

Harnack's neo-Kantian 'dogma', upon which he bases his historical conception, is treated as an *a priori* starting point for appreciating Christ that is itself independent of history. This greatly complicates the relationship between 'historical science' and 'religious positions' as far as Trubetskoi is concerned.

---

[508] Annex 2:2.5.
[509] Annex 2:2.4.
[510] The hermeneutic consequences of this are considered by Gadamer in the chapter 'The ontology of the work of art and its hermeneutic significance': Gadamer, Hans-Georg, *Truth and Method,* 102-171.
[511] Trubetskoi, Evgenii, *Icons: Theology in Color,* translated Vakar, Gertrude, (New York: SVS Press, 1973).
[512] 'Art and Theurgy', Bulgakov, Sergius, *Unfading Light*, 382-403.

> Can science change our religious position? To a certain extent – yes. But on the one hand, this historical science is itself dependent on our religious position, and on the other hand there are religious positions, which are so historical in themselves, that they allow themselves to be reformed with difficulty by a necessarily incomplete science.[513]

Men (3.1.2) makes a similar point concerning the difficulty of maintaining the objectivity of any 'historical' methodology, and his four rules for biblical interpretation (2.2) try to take this into account. The fact that Harnack's *History of Dogma* is dominated by a religious conception Trubetskoi does not see necessarily as a problem, even if unacknowledged, but Harnack's views have no claim to special treatment. His theory of the succession of the three confessions, based on the idea that 'historical science' demands a return to 'pure faith', is actually 'theogonic' and appeals to Harnack due to its 'ascending scale', but it is a pragmatic tool for expressing the meaning of biblical and ecclesial history in a certain way. There are other possible approaches with their own advantages and disadvantages. As Trubetskoi states, "as for us, to console us, we have only to imagine a descending scale by placing you at the very bottom of the abyss, in the manner of our orthodox polemicists. And since the 'historical' method is unfavourable to us, we must become 'anti-historical' by putting our Christianity above all history."[514] Trubetskoi suggests that better than either approach would be to see the three confessions as "three living forces, three elements of Christianity", which is as strong an assertion of the value of ecumenism as might be found in the writings of his friend and teacher Vladimir Solov′ev. Trubetskoi wishes to neither be exclusively 'historical' nor 'anti-historical'. He achieves this by recognising the value of interpreting Scripture as an 'image', the hermeneutical implications of which will be discussed in 4.1.3.

Harnack's notion of 'pure faith' is not only problematic because of the philosophical assumptions on which it depends. It is also related to an excessively "idealized image of the

[513] Annex 2:2.6.
[514] Annex 2:2.10.

primitive gospel" that has been sterilized from "its theurgic elements – its realistic pneumatism". These are elements that Trubetskoi believed essential to the original Gospel, not later additions. He later stated the following in *Teaching of the Logos.*

> It is correct that the Gospel triumphed through its inner truth, its word; but in this word power was felt and appeared (ἐξουσία). It is correct that the Gospel preached the highest truth and the highest good; but this truth was recognised as actual judgment, and goodness as actual salvation, as all-powerful blessing, that even physical evil and death cannot limit.[515]

He then continues.

> In the apostolic Church "the Spirit" was not a teaching or a dogma, but the central fact of religious life, a power tested for real, an occurrence that believers experienced in their own holy enthusiasm. The overabundance of this power was revealed not only in the depth of ethical consciousness, in the faith of the regenerated person, but in bodily life itself, in all its activities, in works of mercy and signs – visions, healings, in prophecies and other unusual actions and ecstatic states, the reality of which was recognised by all.[516]

All of this was based in the Person of Christ himself, the 'pneumatic' par excellence. Trubetskoi remarks on his 'power', "the 'works' that Jesus did with power... are not only 'powers'... and signs (such as healings and casting out demons), but all His works, in which He appears as a pneumatic, with respect to external appearances, following His spirit and inspiration in everything".[517]

If for Harnack these sacred "forces" led to 'the idolatry of Christ the sacrament',[518] Trubetskoi believed them to be an integral part of not only the original Gospel, but also the later christological formulations that sought to make sense of them. Trubetskoi writes to Harnack the following.

---

[515] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 442.
[516] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 446.
[517] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 451.
[518] Annex 2:2.8.

You will tell me that these are enthusiastically produced facts: all the more widespread is the idea to which they corresponded, the disposition of mind that produced them. Certainly all these miracles and wonders, true or legendary, soon paled before the resurrection, and then before the ever clearer awareness of the divinity of Christ. But must we not see in these realistic theurgic beliefs – so strongly developed, so natural – an element, an elementary force of primitive Christianity, and then – a factor of later mysticism in its two branches – worship and dogma?[519]

Gnosticism has attempted to graft itself onto this 'pneumatic realism', and its danger is so great precisely because of this proximity. Men agreed with Trubetskoi that this pneumatic realism was an integral part of the original Gospel, and remarks in a chapter of *Son of Man* entitled *The Signs of the Kingdom*[520] that Christ's miracles were not mere 'symbols'. His healings were a real struggle against demonic powers and they "demonstrated the close connection between the state of the body and soul". Curiously, however, Men found support for this view in the writings of Harnack (3.1.2).

Although Men used Trubetskoi's later *Teaching of the Logos* rather than Trubetskoi's letters as his primary source for theological reflection on the theology of Harnack and Trubetskoi, analysing these letters delineates with greater clarity the lines of conflict between the views of Harnack and Trubetskoi. First, we see much discussion of the relationship between historical science and faith in interpretation. This became a major theme in Trubetskoi's later methodology, as well as Men's *Wellsprings,* the first volume of *In Search of the Way, the Truth, and the Life,* and was related to the question of how that faith is best transferred or portrayed, through dogma or images, as well as the philosophy of Trubetskoi's later *Foundations of Idealism* (1896) (see 3.5.2). Second, we see significant differences in the christological conceptions of Harnack and Trubetskoi. For Trubetskoi, Christ is the God-Man, and the Eucharist is a real continuation of the redemptive work of the Incarnation, which is expressed not only through an abstract 'word', but physically and pneumatically through healings and miracles. In this, Men clearly follows Trubetskoi's critique of Harnack. These

[519] Annex 2:2.9.
[520] Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий. 147-158.

questions relate closely to Trubetskoi's examination of the notion of Logos in *Teaching of the Logos* (1900). Finally, Trubetskoi has little optimism that a 'pure faith' may be so easily extracted from the Gospel accounts, first because he believes that such a notion requires recourse to certain philosophical assumptions, and second because it requires arbitrarily writing out of the Gospel accounts the pneumatic realism that is so clearly present. His discussion of 'pneumatic realism' builds clear bridges both with Gnosticism in the early Church on the one hand, and Jewish Old Testament, especially apocalyptic, thought on the other. Thus, this is one reason why the precise relationship between the Gospel accounts and the Old Testament also becomes a major point of interest for Trubetskoi in his *Teaching of the Logos* and Men in his *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life.*

3.4) Aleksandr Men's Accounts of Sergei Trubetskoi's Biblical Thought in *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life* and *Dictionary of Biblical Studies*

We have briefly discussed Men's account of the relationship between Harnack and Trubetskoi (3.1). Having considered the theological aspects of how Men and Trubetskoi both appropriated and criticised Harnack's views on the *History of Dogma,* we can return to Men's theological engagement with Trubetskoi. Leaving aside Men's views on Trubetskoi's philosophical thought (3.5), we turn to Men's *Dictionary* article on the philosopher, his most substantial discussion of Trubetskoi's theological and, specifically, biblical thought. Nonetheless, it will be instructive to compare the contents of the article with Men's use of Trubetskoi's ideas in his earlier 'religious histories', showing how it sheds light on these more explicitly 'interpretive' works.

In these earlier works it is also *Teaching of the Logos* that is referred to most often, although

the fourth volume of *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life,* entitled *Dionysus, Logos, Fate,* which is concerned with the development of Greek philosophy, also cites Trubetskoi's lectures and his *Metaphysics in Ancient Greece.* In *Son of Man* and the earlier volumes of his *In Search,* other Russian school figures such as Solov′ev, Bulgakov and Berdyaev have a greater profile than Trubetskoi, but he is still cited. The sixth volume, *On the Threshold of the New Covenant,* especially draws on Trubetskoi's *Teaching of the Logos* to explicate the connection between Gospel themes and those of the Old Testament. As noted above, this is one of the key areas of difference with Harnack, who wished to 'purify' the Gospel faith from metaphysical 'pagan' elements. Furthermore, it may be asserted that Men's *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life*, and Trubetskoi's *Teaching of the Logos* bear more than a passing resemblance to one another. Although ostensibly works of 'religious history', both begin with an introduction that presents a detailed philosophical methodology (in Men's case this is *Wellsprings*) for engaging with that 'religious history'. The influence of Harnack's *History of Dogma* is palpable. Both then combine discussions of how Old Testament and pagan ideas look forward to Christ in different ways and to different extents. Although Trubetskoi's discussions of Eastern mysticism are not as extensive,[521] Men's *Dionysus, Logos, Fate* parallels Part I of *Teaching of the Logos* in its assessment of the thought of Ancient Greece.[522] Men explains why in his *Dictionary* article.

Trubetskoi assigned great significance to the preparations for receiving the Gospel in pre-Christian consciousness, in connection with which he frequently turned to the problems of the comparative-

[521] Men devoted the entirety of volume three of *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life,* (У врат молчания) to this, as well as parts of volumes two (Магизм и единобожие) and six (На пороге нового завета). Trubetskoi, although he did not give it detailed discussion in *Teaching of the Logos,* was interested in Oriental mysticism, like Vladimir Solov′ev. His most extended discussion of Oriental mysticism came in *Foundations of Idealism* (1896). Bulgakov criticised Trubetskoi for primarily using examples of spirituality from Oriental religions rather than Byzantine monasticism. Similar criticisms have been levelled at Men by conservative critics. Kuraev (Кураев А. Александр Мень: потерявшийся миссионер) claims "[according to Men] the whole of world culture was created by believers. If someone supported the ethical progress of the nations, then this was religions. It is not true that religion is darkness: there is good in any religion and, *incidentally*, in Christianity."

[522] Мень А.прот. Дионис, Логос, Судьба. Греческая религия и философия от эпохи колонизации до Александра. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009.

religious study of the Bible.... He was the first among Russian scientists to compile a bibliography for the history of religions.[523]

Men's *Dictionary* article comes later than his *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life* (1.2.2) and is a considered assessment of the significance of Trubetskoi's biblical theology. It consists of three parts, a general introduction, *The Problematic of Old Testament Theology in Trubetskoi's Work*, and *Christology in Trubetskoi's System*. The second and third sections primarily reflect on the content of *Teaching of the Logos* Part II. The first gives a brief introduction to his principal works, and then discusses the two characteristics that distinguish Trubetskoi among other Russian Orthodox thinkers: his christocentricity and his active polemic with Liberal Protestantism.

3.4.1) On Sergei Trubetskoi's Christocentrism and its Implications for Biblical Interpretation

Concerning the first of these, it has been noted above that Trubetskoi differed from Harnack in believing it essential to see Christ as the 'God-Man' rather than the 'highest' of all human beings. From Men's article on 'Christology' in his *Dictionary,*[524] it seems Men agreed with Trubetskoi that even the apostolic kerygma presented the divine-humanity of Christ as the most important basis of the Church's christology. Thus both agree that the revelation of the Person of the Christ must be seen as divine revelation. Men cites Trubetskoi's response to Butkevich, a conservative polemicist:[525] "the meaning of Christianity...[526] is contained first of all and most significantly, in perfect form, it may be said, in the Person of Christ. The Christian church itself is only the revelation of this Person in human society, its social body... I see in it divine revelation." This divinity, for Trubetskoi, is not an abstract idea, but a living, ethical (but not merely ethical) form that brings concrete judgment and redemption. Here

[523] Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том третий. 269.
[524] Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том третий. 362.
[525] Трубецкой С.Н. Мнимое язычество или ложное христианство? 157.
[526] This is possibly an allusion to Harnack's lecture series.

Men's discussion already touches on the themes discussed in Trubetskoi's first letter to Harnack (3.3) and on the unacknowledged arbitrariness of Harnack's neo-Kantian philosophical starting point. Despite attempts from conservatives, such as Butkevich, to portray Trubetskoi as a follower of Harnack, Western philosophy and the Liberal Protestant school, Men is keen to demonstrate that in fact Trubetskoi was not a straightforward 'moralist', interested merely in objectivising Jesus as the greatest ethical preacher in history. He cites Trubetskoi on this.[527]

> It cannot be doubted that Christ did not bring any new metaphysical, philosophical teaching. But at the same time He can hardly be recognised as an "ethicist" or a "moralist" in the general sense of the word. It was noticed long ago that individual ethical rules of Christ, although not in such ideal fullness and purity, were found partly in the teachings of Jewish teachers and prophets, partly in the morals of pagan philosophers. The originality of the ethical teaching of Christ and its incomparable integrity and perfection are conditioned by the singular and completely new purely-religious basis that He gave to ethical life, founding in His Person a new relationship to God and to the world.[528]

On the basis of this strong personalism, it is clear that, in Men's words, "revelation cannot be approached as a petrified relic, for it is inseparable from the living spiritual experience of concrete personality."[529] In other words, the role assigned to the Person of Christ has deep implications for Trubetskoi's overall approach to biblical interpretation. Thus we find that Trubetskoi's understanding of Christ leads him to a position not far from that of Solov′ev (2.2.2). While not quite as radical as the 'kerygmatic' criticisms of Barth and Bultmann,[530] it is nonetheless framed carefully as a response to Liberal Protestant hermeneutical methods. Trubetskoi emphasises the importance of the 'preliminary' value of critical methods, while denying its ability to establish a 'value-neutral' approach to hermeneutics. These methods present us with information that is of value when considering questions of biblical interpretation.[531] Even if "science does not decide questions of faith", it can "show how such

[527] Трубецкой С.Н. Этика и догматика II: https://www.litmir.me/br/?b=559067&p=2 [Accessed 15/12/2018].
[528] Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том третий. 269.
[529] Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том третий. 269.
[530] Thiselton, Anthony, *Hermeneutics*, 187.
[531] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 406.

questions were set and resolved in history".[532] A particular example would be the light shed by critical methods on Jesus' understanding of Messianism.[533] Critical methods are limited in their potential, however, and the reason is that both Trubetskoi, and following him, Men, have a high view of the revelatory quality of the Bible. The truths of revelation cannot themselves lose their revelatory character, once given, to be treated only as the empirical facts of memory. Their significance does not consist in providing sustenance for nostalgia, but in enlightening the traditions of the church through their revelatory character. Thus, despite their inculcation of certain aspects of the new isagogics, for both Trubetskoi and Men the Bible takes priority over tradition to an unusual degree in Russian Orthodoxy; due to its radical revelatory character it has a foundational role as an authority in all matters of faith, even if, as both insist, the church and tradition are not only retained as the source for authoritative reproduction and interpretation, but allocated ontological primacy. This is because what is allocated ontological primacy is not the ecclesiastical institution and its interpretation of 'the Fathers', but the sacramental centre of the ecclesial life (2.2.1, 2.2.3), which is to be identified with the divine-human centre of the biblical narrative.

Men relates Trubetskoi's approach to biblical interpretation explicitly to his christology at the end of his *Dictionary* article on the philosopher, maintaining against such commentators as Butkevich, that Trubetskoi merely rejected 'monophysitism' in biblical interpretation.

> Christ, as we believe, is true God and perfect human according to body, soul and spirit. All kinds of negation or diminishing of His human nature, whatever pious intentions they might hide behind, however they might be disguised, are docetism, a heresy condemned by the Church. The Gospel tells us much that is miraculous about the earthly life of the Saviour, His birth and Resurrection, about how He healed the sick, resurrected the dead, walked on water, and increased the quantity of bread: He could have done limitlessly more. But the most miraculous thing of all for us is that he hungered and thirsted, grew tired and suffered; that He had friends among people and cried over a friend who had died, who He, as God, had the power to bring back to life; that He despaired in mortal suffering. The most miraculous miracle of the whole Gospel, embracing all miracles and containing within itself all

[532] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 412-3.
[533] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 454-5.

of our hope, the mystery of our salvation; this is that he was human. And therefore all diminishing or negation of the human nature in Christ, any shadow of docetism, is for the Christian falsehood and unbelief, a sin against faith and against Christ.[534]

Although the passage Men cites does not in itself explicitly link the christological views it espouses to matters of biblical interpretation, the context as a response to Butkevich's accusations of 'rationalism' certainly does so implicitly. A full appreciation of the human nature of Christ not only justifies, but requires scientific analysis of the biblical texts. Any rejection of this kind of analysis is condemned in the strongest terms as 'docetism', 'falsehood' and 'unbelief'.

3.4.2) The Old Testament and Messianism in Sergei Trubetskoi's *Teaching of the Logos*

Men remarks that Trubetskoi was among the first Russian Orthodox thinkers to apply the 'new isagogics' (2.1.3) to Old Testament interpretation, and indeed the positions taken by Trubetskoi in his interpretation of the Old Testament are often very close to those of Men (and Kartashev, to whom Men also appeals (2.1.3)).

Thus in *The Religious Ideal of the Jews*, Trubetskoi begins by discussing the Old Testament background to the 'Messianic Kingdom'. The Mosaic Covenant was the first to be between God and the nation of Israel,[535] and the monarchical structure of ancient Israel was reconciled with this early 'covenant' by the Davidic Covenant (2 Samuel 7). From this point the notion of the 'Messianic Kingdom' developed, not only as a future political hope, but as an ideal, with an increasingly idealized Davidic King. The prophetic writings assign to it a universal religious nature as a result of the various catastrophes faced by Israel in its historical course. The Kingdom of God was not an understanding that suddenly appeared out of nowhere in the

[534] Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том третий. 273. Трубецкой С.Н. Мнимое язычество или ложное христианство? 172.
[535] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 234.

midst of history; it revealed itself as a spiritual reality only gradually against the background of progressive disillusionment with the earthly monarchy. As with Men, this does not involve 'religious evolutionism', especially since certain aspects of ancient Israelite religion, such as monotheism, were present from the beginning. In Trubetskoi's analysis of the prophetic books, we see a careful presentation of how these original themes developed over time. Thus, Amos and Hosea preached judgment and salvation in the Northern Kingdom, followed closely by Isaiah and Micah in Judah in the eighth-century BCE. The concept of a 'remnant' began with the prophecy of Isaiah 11 and Isaiah and Micah represented the person of a coming Messiah. At the beginning of the Babylonian exile, Jeremiah and Ezekiel both foresaw a long period of testing between judgment and salvation. Jeremiah in particular concerned himself with the inner renewal of Israel, represented by a new covenant that God would seal with his people (Jeremiah 31:31-34). Like Men, Trubetskoi treated Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah as one Persian-era figure, interested in consistent themes: comfort, salvation, the forgiveness of sins and the good news of redemption. Like Men, Trubetskoi saw particular significance in the prophetic image of the Suffering Servant (Isaiah 52:13-53:12) and the "suffering God-consciousness" of Jeremiah[536] that led to his prophecy of a "new covenant". Both biblical figures placed these 'prophetic' visions of a suffering redeemer in dialectical relation with 'earthly' Messianic hopes. In *Teaching of the Logos,* Trubetskoi carefully establishes the link with Messianism, while noting that it has two principal directions: apocalypticism, and the Talmudic 'teaching' of the Messiah.[537] Trubetskoi ends his discussion by commenting on the relationship between OT and NT Messianism, thus establishing a close link between the two.

This latest Messianism, developing from the time of the Maccabees, significantly differs from the Messianism of the Old Testament, to which it is attached. The New Testament preaching of the

[536] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе, 256.
[537] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе, 235-237.

Kingdom in many ways includes within itself a reform of its contemporary Messianism. As with any true reform, it is not a straightforward destruction of the old, but its "fulfilment". In the well-known sense it is a *return* to the religious source of the Law – to that God-consciousness, which was the faith of the patriarchs and prophets, and which was lost in the dead orthodoxy of the scribes and the teachers of the Law; at the same time this reform is a *renewal,* insofar as Christ does not limit Himself to a simple return just to the prophets or a prophetic ministry, but in the fullness of His God-consciousness recognises Himself as the true Son of God, in which the Kingdom of God is not only foreseen and not only supposed, as a promise or command, but is fulfilled, is established, and actually comes in its truth and power.[538]

Later Messianism is presented as a heterogenous development to which Jesus' own Messianism brings not only reform as a return to the earlier prophets (reminiscent of Trubetskoi's account of the Reformation in his *Metaphysics in Ancient Greece*, see 3.3), but 'realises' the Kingdom in a way that is wholly new. If we want to consider the 'seed' of the God-man implanted in history, then according to Trubetskoi, we need therefore to look primarily to the earlier prophetism. "In order to comprehend historically the Christian idea of divine-humanity, in order to understand the religion of the God-man, it is necessary to turn to the God-consciousness of the prophets, not to the apocalyptic teaching of the scribes".[539] Men cites Trubetskoi on this matter.

From the apocryphal writings, it can be seen that their authors saw history in the spirit of predestination. In this way they unwillingly drew close to astrology and Stoic fatalism, the most popular doctrines of the epoch. If in the Apocalypse of Daniel the spirit of prophetism is preserved, the apocryphal writings all too often ended up outside the frame of Scripture.[540]

The spiritual experience of true prophetism avoids the resigned fatalism of apocalypticism. Rather it is marked by close social engagement and involvement with the life of the people. Men also follows Trubetskoi's interpretation of the social role of the prophet.

The prophet struggles with his people for God, and this struggle happens in the public domain as a sermon of accusation and teaching, but in his heart he likewise struggles with God for his people: God overcomes him and forces him to speak when he does not want to.... Where the prophet has no words of comfort, he brings his lament.... In God is found the only higher good for the prophet and for Israel,

[538] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе, 237.
[539] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе, 342.
[540] Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета, книга I, 332. Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 312.

its Kingdom, its glory, its soundness and strength.[541]

For both Men and Trubetskoi the prophets are emphasised as precursors to the God-man. They are the only true antecessors of the Gospel in world religious history. As Men tells us, Old Testament theophany and the God-man of the New Testament stand apart from intuitive knowledge. "A fiery border separates natural, intuitive God-knowledge from biblical theophany, from the self-appearance of God in the Old Testament, from the complete 'God-man' of the New Testament".[542] In *Son of Man* he tells us that "Jesus returned the Old Testament to its sources, to the Ten Commandments of Sinai, to the true inheritance of Moses, preserved by the Prophets."[543] Men devotes many pages of *Messengers* to an exposition of the development of the prophetic consciousness in Israel, agreeing with Trubetskoi in *The Religious Ideal of the Jews* that the Kingdom of God forms the centre of this prophetic consciousness.[544] Trubetskoi introduces Schleiermacher's term 'God-consciousness'[545] to describe the relationship between Christ and the Old Testament understanding of the Kingdom of God.

> This kingdom is a union, a full interaction and unification with God that is realised in Israel only in part, but has come to be in it fully in the glory of the chosen people and in the forgiveness of all peoples. The purpose of this kingdom is the coming and revealing of the glory of God or the realisation of God on earth. If the religion of Israel is thirst for God that is quenched in the consciousness of Him, then Christ is the justification of this religion, its Messiah, first of all, as incarnated God-consciousness.[546]

While this notion demonstrates a close link between Christ and the prophets, both Trubetskoi and Men also see the 'God-consciousness' of Jesus Christ the God-man as qualitatively

---

[541] Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том третий. 270, Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе, 248-9.
[542] Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие, 13.
[543] Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий. 104.
[544] Мень А.прот. Вестники..., 6.
[545] Schleiermacher, Friedrich, *The Christian Faith.* (Berkeley CA: Apocryphile Press, 2011). Christ has the perfect 'God-consciousness': "to ascribe to Christ an absolutely powerful God-consciousness, and to attribute to Him an existence of God in Him, are exactly the same thing" (387). It should be noted that this is terminology not frequently repeated by thinkers of the later German Liberal Protestant tradition.
[546] Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том третий. 270-1, Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 263-4.

distinct from Old Testament 'prophetic consciousness'. Jesus' Kingdom is not simply preached, but realised. The God-man and His God-consciousness thus become the foundation or *telos* of Old Testament prophetism, and divine-humanity the revelatory centre-point of Old Testament hermeneutics. This in turn provides the basis for a philosophy of Old Testament history. Men summarises Trubetskoi's thinking.[547]

> The Kingdom of God is a kingdom of truth and kindness, honesty and goodness, it is the final purpose of God in history, the final purpose of the world, including within itself the entire meaning of the world process, its rational basis. This kingdom that the prophets foresaw as divine necessity, drew near and actually comes in the new revelation.[548]

The outlines of the approaches taken by Men and Trubetskoi are closely connected, even if the detail of Men's work depends on more recent material.

Given the common interest in prophecy as preparation for the coming of Jesus Christ, it should be no surprise that Men speaks with special enthusiasm of Trubetskoi's account of Messianism in the Old and New Testaments. As he states, "the stages in the revelation of the teaching of the Messiah are considered in... [*Teaching of the Logos*], which is the best study of the theme of Messianism in the Russian language."[549] For Men, this was the central element of Trubetskoi's biblical theology; he investigated the development of Old Testament Messianism "as a multilayered and dynamic teaching closely connected with the idea of the Kingdom of God."[550] Men writes on the Messianic faith of the Old Testament and its connection with the Kingdom of God in *Isagogics.*[551]

> The Messianic faith of the Old Testament formed out of the juxtaposition of real history and the ideal of the Anointed One. Through the Anointed King, according to S. Trubetskoi, "divine truth and power

[547] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. Часть II, Глава I.
[548] Men cites Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 233 in Библиологический Словарь. Том третий. 270.
[549] Мень А.прот. Вестники..., 497з.42.
[550] Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том третий. 270.
[551] Мень А.прот. Исагогика, 271-2.

is realised on earth, the power and glory of Israel; he is righteous, virtuous and mighty according to his office and calling, according to his anointing. And the more the non-conformity of certain kings to this Anointing is displayed... the more the form of the 'true' Messiah gains ideal significance, the liberator of the people, the king of truth and peace, longed for by all captives, the dejected, all those weeping and wronged, widows and orphans, oppressed by the powerful, the faithful, those groaning under servitude to pagans".[552]

This duality is most clearly expressed in the biblical accounts of the life of King David, Men tells us. Messianism is primarily related to the person of the king, although nonetheless this relation is not exclusively the case. In *Messengers,* Men refers to Trubetskoi again to determine which kinds of people were referred to as 'Messiah' in Ancient Israel. The term referred to those who were dedicated to ministry by the Spirit of the Lord: "prophets, priests, but most of all kings".[553] In a note he comments on this.[554] "'The Messianism of Old Testament Jews,' S. Trubetskoi remarks judiciously, 'cannot be called a static dogma of their faith.'"[555]

With respect to Men's appropriation of Trubetskoi's views on Old Testament prophetism and messianism, there is another matter that should not be overlooked. Both Men and Trubetskoi saw a connection between the struggles of prophetism for the messianic realisation of the Kingdom and the diversity of religious experience in antiquity. Thus one of the key dialectics of spiritual history in their works became the clash between monotheism and pagan polytheism.[556]

For both Men and Trubetskoi, this led not only to considerable interest in pre-Christian religions, but an intriguing and controversial ambivalence towards the monastic traditions of Eastern Orthodoxy, which they saw as a retreat from the dialectical struggle of social

[552] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 238.
[553] Мень А.прот. Вестники..., 123.
[554] Мень А.прот. Вестники..., 497з.42.
[555] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 234.
[556] Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том третий. 270, also *Magic Art and Monotheism* (the concept 'magic art' is from Bulgakov, *Unfading Light,* 363-4). Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 245.

involvement. The social concern of the prophets "infinitely separates... [them] from the individualistic monastic mysticism of the Middle Ages with its seclusion from the world, from humanity and sometimes from the Church".[557] That "Orthodox mysticism remains a completely untouched area for gnoseological investigation" in Trubetskoi's work, despite its connection with religious philosophy, is therefore perhaps not as surprising as Bulgakov suggests in his article on Trubetskoi.[558] Men follows Trubetskoi rather than Bulgakov in this, largely ignoring the Medieval mystical theology of Palamas in his major works; as we mentioned in 1.2.3, among Men's 1790 *Dictionary* articles there is no entry on Palamas, and in his six-volume *In Search of the Way, the Truth and Life,* Palamas is mentioned very infrequently, and accorded a somewhat dubious status where he is.[559] Despite attempts to excuse both Trubetskoi and Men from this 'oversight' on the grounds that they were apologetes rather than theologians,[560] it should be recognised that, in addition, the priorities of their philosophical and exegetical thought did not correspond with those of Palamas and the monastics. Theirs is an alternative 'Orthodox' narrative to the so-called Neo-Palamite synthesis of V.N. Lossky and studies of John Meyendorff that saw the thought of Gregory Palamas as the definitive guide to genuine Eastern Orthodoxy spiritual practice and theology.[561] Just to what extent the references to hesychast practice in Men's *Practical Guide to Prayer* rectify this matter may be debated.[562]

[557] Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том третий. 270. Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 248.

[558] Булгаков С.Н. Философия кн. С.Н. Трубецкого и духовная борьба современности (рецензия). 8.

[559] Palamas' inclusion in a list of 'mystics' would be highly controversial among Men's conservative critics: "Following the path set out by meditation, Indian Brahmins arrived at the same place as all mystics, whatever people or age they belonged to. Yajnavalkya, Buddha, Plotinus, the Areopagite, Meister Eckhart, Gregory Palamas, the kabbalists, Nicholas of Cusa, Jakob Boehme, John of Ruusbroec and many other seers of the East and West with a unanimity that compels a sense of awe, tell us about what they have found out, approaching the limits of existence themselves." Мень А.прот. У врат молчания, 80.

[560] Булгаков С.Н. Философия кн. С.Н. Трубецкого и духовная борьба современности (рецензия). 16. Кураев А.диак. Александр Мень: потерявшийся миссионер gives a similar argument.

[561] Lossky, Vladimir, *Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*.

[562] This work has a complex genesis - Bibliography 1.1.6. The English edition, published as *An Inner Step Towards God: Writings and Teachings on Prayer by Father Alexander Men* (Brewster, Mass.: Paraclete Press, 2014) is not so much a standalone work as a compilation of materials taken from Men's lectures, sermons, prayers and various handbooks for his parishioners. A thorough investigation of Men's approach to prayer on the basis of this work is beyond the scope of the present study, yet although there is much reflection on a variety of practices from the Patristic period to the twentieth century, little space is accorded specifically to Palamite thought.

For one thing, such mysticism has an ambivalent relation to the idea of history as a linear process. For both Trubetskoi and Men the Kingdom of God was not only the final purpose of God, but also the final purpose of the world process. One of the distinguishing features of Old Testament prophetism is its positing of a beginning and end to the world. The world is an unfinished 'open system', with ascending rather than circular movement (but without the 'descending' narrative of 'corruption' espoused by Harnack). "The prophets were the first to see time as something moving ahead, the dynamic *becoming* of creation was revealed to them".[563] In this way their ideas stood apart from other pre-Christian religious teachings. The reversion that Trubetskoi and Men see in some kinds of monastic practice to a static and 'circular' view of the world is essentially a reversion to the approaches of certain pre-Christian religions. True Christianity both takes its guide from the prophets and interprets them through the Person of Christ. This gives a dialectical and dynamic account of sacred history.

Although rather dismissive of Neo-Palamite 'mystical theology', Men and Trubetskoi agree with various Russian Orthodox theological writers active in the West on the centrality of the church in matters of biblical interpretation, at least with respect to its sacramental character and liturgical practices. Yet, for both, the nature of the Church is rooted in Old Testament ecclesial practice (2.2.3.1 discusses the 'Old Testament Church') at the same time as being fundamentally dynamic and progressive. Specifically, the strange unification of a national ideal that limits the community of faith with a "spiritual ethical revelation of the one God" that is universalising means that a Revelation destined for the whole world is progressively revealed first to the Old Testament Church and then in all its fullness to the Church of the

[563] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 328-9. Мень А.прот. Вестники..., 15.

New Testament.[564] In this way, Trubetskoi shows that the belief in forgiveness that brings peace to the Old Testament Church becomes a type of the messianic desire for the transfiguration of all creation, in essence the ancestor of divine-human culture. Men summarises Trubetskoi's account of Israel's Messianism. "Israel believed that after repentance God would forgive her and eternally be present among her people. This faith in the coming of God, in the final theophany was the genuine messianic faith."[565] An ecclesial eschatological vision cannot be separated from the whole of the Old Testament faith, connected as it is, with the realisation of divine goodwill in the lives of people, the Kingdom of God.

Thus, it is not only the coming of Christ to earth that is presaged by the religion of the Old Testament. The Church finds its roots in the Old Testament community of faith, in the 'Old Testament Church' to use Bulgakov's phase. Two further points should be noted concerning the 'fulfilment' of the Old Testament in the New: first of all, the Trinity is reflected in the Old Testament notions of Spirit, Wisdom and Word (discussed together with Trubetskoi's views on sophiology in 3.5); second, the role of eschatology in the later apocalyptic works of the Old Testament period finds its expression in New Testament apocalyptic literature (discussed in 3.6.2).

3.4.3) Christology and Realized Eschatology in Sergei Trubetskoi's *Teaching of the Logos*

Men begins describing Trubetskoi's christology almost as though he is describing his own. "The historical method of Trubetskoi showed itself in that Trubetskoi only approaches the problematic of the Gospels after a thorough examination of the panorama of the religious life

[564] Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том третий. 270. Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 252.
[565] Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том третий. 270. The millennial kingdom is discussed in 3.6.2.

of the intertestamental period."[566] The Person of Jesus Christ is considered in the fifth and final chapter of *Teaching of the Logos* Part II. Of course, if Men's *Son of Man* and *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life* are read together (although it should be stressed that Men saw them as separate works, see 1.2) then it is clear that Men covered the ground of Trubetskoi's fifth chapter in considerable depth in *Son of Man*. In the appendix Men gives a fairly detailed discussion of various isagogical details, including those concerned with how 'Messianism' and the 'Kingdom of God' were understood by the sects of first-century Judaism.[567] Although Men's portrayal of Christ in *Son of Man* preceded his six-volume history of world religions chronologically, it was reworked and revised throughout his life in conjunction with the larger work, and the appendix appears to be a later addition. Parts of the second, fifth and sixth volumes of *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life* parallel Trubetskoi's *Teaching of the Logos* Part II Chapters 1-4. Men continues his description of Trubetskoi's fifth chapter.

> In this chapter the scientific-critical method is organically fused with a theological approach. Trubetskoi polemicises with those views, according to which the Gospel is just part of a natural evolution of ancient beliefs.[568] No matter how significant elements of Old Testament tradition might have been in the teaching of Christ, the appearance itself of Christ was something absolutely new, mysterious and incomprehensible. Precisely because of this, from the earliest times there arose the most varied assessments of Him. "The only unification of personal self-consciousness with God-consciousness in history, which we find only in Him and which comprises His being itself, cannot be explained by the influence of His context; conversely the whole of His relationship to this context is explained precisely by this central fact of His consciousness".[569]

Trubetskoi both relates biblical interpretation and biblical theology and continues the Schleiermacherian language already noted above to emphasise the uniqueness of Christ and His 'God-consciousness'.[570] Although the 'prophetic consciousness' stood apart from the

[566] Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том третий. 271.
[567] Also Men's *Dictionary* article *Gospels* in Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том первый. 380-409, especially the fourth section Апостольская керигма и Евангелия, 383-384.
[568] Men probably has Wellhausen in mind: 'Wellhausen', Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том первый. 197-200.
[569] Men cites Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 408 in his Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том третий. 271-2.
[570] Men notes use of 'God-consciousness' in his lecture on Trubetskoi: Русская религиозная философия, 85.

various kinds of 'intuitive knowledge', there is a qualitative difference between them and the Person of Christ, who is understood to be the Absolute Person. We cannot start with the peripheral matters of Jesus Christ's historical context if we truly wish to understand Him. We must engage with the Person of Christ, and through this what we read about his context in the Scriptures is illuminated. "The God-consciousness of Christ itself, although inaccessible in its fullness to our limited understanding, remains an undoubted actuality, from which scientific thought can and should set off."[571] Although Trubetskoi recognises that Christ showed his true form to his disciples through the media of words and actions, which became a 'repository' of religious experience and corrective to subjective experience, His focus on the absolute content of the Person of Christ contrasts markedly with Harnack's historical approach, and its 'neo-Kantian' philosophical presuppositions. Schleiermacher's term 'God-consciousness' is unified with Solov′ev's 'divine-humanity'; the two terms describe the absolute nature and concrete content of Christ's Person from different directions. Although Men is more likely to refer to the 'divine-humanity' in his own works, he does on occasion use this Schleiermacherian language. 'His [Christ's] self-consciousness is completely different to the self-consciousness of other people. He is not a seeker of the truth, but the Truth itself. He teaches not from the Person of God, as the prophets, but only from Himself'.[572]

It is not just the nature of Christ's Person that cannot be explained with mere recourse to questions of historical context, but also his rejection and Cross, representing the *kenosis* of the Gospel narrative. Men explains that for Trubetskoi, "the Incarnation is the greatest of challenges to the world and judgment over it."[573] It is clear from the various ways in which His followers addressed him by various titles including 'teacher' and 'prophet' that Jesus

[571] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 412.
[572] Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том первый. 403.
[573] Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том третий. 272.

Christ was not immediately recognised as the Messiah. Men uses Trubetskoi's words to summarise this.

> This was truly a testing, and few Christians could guarantee that they would have withstood it in the place of Christ's contemporaries. Caiaphas had not studied Christian dogmatics and saw before him only a human being; and Peter knew only about the glorious Messiah, not allowing any thought of His sufferings.[574]

Given the fairly extended nature of Trubetskoi's reflection on the Cross of Christ both in his *Teaching of the Logos* and in his first letter to Harnack (3.3), it is notable that Men should choose to accentuate the notion of 'testing' in relation to it when presenting Trubetskoi's thought. As we discussed above, Men's understanding of the role of the Cross in particular, while in many ways close to that of Trubetskoi, is given less discussion than in the published work of the latter.

The kenotic aspect of the Gospel narratives is a major part of the works of both Trubetskoi and Men, however. This is because it is fundamental to Jesus Christ's God-consciousness and the provocation of 'testing' or 'temptation' is a fundamental part of the reaction of the sinful world. Trubetskoi tells us, perhaps drawing on the language of Tareev's *Temptation of the God-Man*[575] that the people and even many of the disciples "were all scattered and tempted by Him".[576] The crowds wanted to transfer onto him their messianic vision (John 6:15), which he had already successfully resisted in the desert temptation (Matthew 4).[577] When he was finally crucified, he was judged for different reasons: as a religious heretic, an enemy of Caesar or simply out of fear or envy, but the common theme is this specifically ontological temptation. "Contemporaries of Christ saw in Him first of all a human, and in this human

[574] Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том третий. 272.
[575] Тареев М.М. Искушение Богочеловека.
[576] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 410.
[577] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 435.

they recognised the spiritual form of that Father, who they confessed in an outer form".[578] Their 'outer' confession of the divinity present in Christ and his challenge to them to accept him as a Person created ontological tension.

This tension is first of all seen in the gap between Jesus' universal significance and his concrete national religious significance.[579] For Trubetskoi, this finds expression in Jesus' self-consciousness as Messiah, the people's reaction to that and the resulting ethical necessity of the Cross, which as the final defeat of 'temptation' (Romans 5:8) is madness to nationalist messianism.[580] The ontological tension is resolved through the Cross, such that the 'law and the prophets' are fulfilled (Matthew 5:17), not as a 'subjective-ethical ideal', but as a real kingdom and life. At this point, Men fails to note the significance of the Cross for Trubetskoi, but he does assert that the most significant aspect of the Gospel accounts for the latter is "the proclamation of a new relationship between God and humanity and the new Revelation concerning the essence of God,"[581] which is made apparent not only in Christ's teaching, but His very Person.

In this way, the Person of Christ has concrete theological content. The Logos of John's Gospel is decisive for both Men and Trubetskoi,[582] since both believe 'Logos' has a concrete Jewish content, the *davar* or Word expressed in theophany. Men remarks on the significance of the 'Fourth Gospel' for Trubetskoi, which, unlike many of his German colleagues,[583] he

[578] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе, 412.

[579] Jesus' ethical universalism and understanding of 'covenant' parallels Jewish prophetism, and his observance of the Law parallels the school of Hillel: Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 419-421 on prophetism, esp. Jeremiah, and Мень А.прот. Вестники on prophetism and На пороге Нового Завета книга II, 218-222 on Hillel.

[580] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 469-471.

[581] Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том третий. 272.

[582] Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий, 368з.161. Theological developments following the Qumran discoveries have much in common with Trubetskoi's ideas: Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том третий. 368.

[583] Although Schleiermacher still held John's Gospel to be authentic and included it in his reconstruction of Gospel history, David Strauss and the Tübingen school opposed this decisively: Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том первый. 399.

believed to be rooted in a tradition coming directly from John, the 'Beloved Disciple'. Trubetskoi spends several pages[584] discussing various 'isagogical' questions concerned with the relationship of the Synoptics and the John's Gospel. Men, building on another eighty years of biblical scholarship, is still keener to assert the reliability of John's Gospel. Thus he remarks that John cites not the Septuagint like the Synoptics, but translates Hebrew and Aramaic targums, and therefore gives a greater sense of the context of the earliest ecclesial tradition than even the Synoptics. Furthermore, John has the most accurate chronology.[585] "The Synoptics did not set themselves the task of giving a sequential depiction of events, but with John, this purpose was clearly present," as demonstrated by John's care to present us with Jesus' annual pilgrimages to Jerusalem,[586] which Men believes would have continued throughout his ministry. The centrality of John's 'theological' account of the Person of Christ in the earliest ecclesial tradition works in favour of Trubetskoi's elucidation of the relationship between New Testament thought and the 'dogma' of the early church, especially since this Gospel gives the strongest expression of divine sonship and the eternity of the Son.[587] Thus, if the theology of divine sonship in the Gospel of John is not simply a later construction, but an authentic theological account of the earliest ecclesial understandings of Christ, then it makes sense to frame Christ's ethical teachings within this theology. They are not mere ethics, but have theological content, closely connected with the newly revealed relation between the Divine Father and His Son. Thus Christ relates to the Law as the One who is its Source.

The Law, although "inviolable to the end of the world, remains in full strength only until the coming of the Kingdom, which is no longer prophesied as before up until the days of John

[584] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе, 415-419.
[585] Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий. 368, Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том первый, 388.
[586] 1) John 2:13-22, (Сын человеческий. 138-145), 2) John 5, (Сын человеческий. 155-158), 3) From John 7 onwards, the location is Jerusalem, as in Сын человеческий, 195 and further.
[587] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 455-459.

the Baptist, but is announced as genuinely close-by."[588] Men summarises in his own words.

> The mystery of the Kingdom is contained in its unnoticed presence in the world already from the moment of Christ's preaching. It is judgment of the world here and now. Emphasizing this, Trubetskoi anticipates the idea of "realised eschatology", formulated in Western theology thirty years after the death of the philosopher [Trubetskoi].[589]

Whether this is entirely accurate may be debated. Perhaps it would be better to claim merely that in Trubetskoi's writing the tension of 'ontological testing' is carried over into how he understands the relationship between the Kingdom of God initiated in the world by Christ and the world as it is. Trubetskoi claims that this is "first of all a notion about the life of the coming age."[590] Eschatology is certainly important to him, as he makes clear.

> In view of [Mark 14:62 etc.], all the recent attempts to decrease the significance of eschatological teaching or even completely remove it from Jesus' preaching present themselves as false even from the historical point of view. Historians and moralists are free not to accept this teaching, but no one gives them the right to cross out from the Gospels what they don't like on the basis of personal sympathy or antipathy.[591]

The sense in which this eschatology is 'realized' is, however, a little less clear. He tells us the Kingdom is preached as a 'coming' and 'near' realisation of Jewish hopes. "The called can enter it, it is given to them, as a gift of God or as a reward." Entering it is to "enter life (Mark 9:45; Matthew 18:8)," which Trubetskoi clarifies, is not a "purely subjective spiritual-ethical good, but the fullness of life", which abolishes both ethical and physical death.[592] The tension of eschatological and ethical initiated by the ontological testing of encounter with the Person

---

[588] Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том третий, 272, cites Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 431.

[589] Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том третий, 272. Also 'C.H. Dodd', Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том первый. 356-358, and William Davies and Daube, David (eds.), *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology, in honour of C.H. Dodd,* (Cambridge: CUP, 1956). Men is not referring to an 'over-realized eschatology' where the content of the Kingdom is coterminous with Jesus' words and ministry in the Gospels. As is clear from Men's interpretation of Revelation 20-22 (3.6.2), the 'realized eschatology' Men sees in Trubetskoi's work involves the linear development of world history towards the millennial kingdom.

[590] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 429.

[591] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 438.

[592] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 429.

of Christ is to be resolved by the fact that in the Kingdom of God, eschatology has an ethical content while ethics have an eschatological teleology. Eschatology is better described as 'revealed' than 'realized' in the Person of Christ. It is fully grounded by the kenotic nature of Christ's ministry and death on the Cross, yet Jesus in his earthly ministry looks forward to the realisation of the Kingdom of God as the "highest purpose of the world process, as a realisation of divine order, a realisation of God or the divine life on earth."[593] Divine Sonship is connected to the Kingdom of God, and Men's discussion of the nature of the Kingdom of God in *Son of Man* seems to come from the same stable as Trubetskoi's account of Messianic theology.[594] There are real ethical and ecclesial implications here and now,[595] presented to us in the Sermon on the Mount and the Two Commandments.[596] If Men's use of the term 'realized eschatology' to describe Trubetskoi's biblical thought is to be accepted, then it should be with some care and qualification as to what precisely is meant, which is not provided by Men. Fundamentally, this is not an 'over-realized eschatology' where the content of the Kingdom is coterminous with Jesus' ministry in the Gospels. The kind of 'realized eschatology' Men has in mind is rather one that gives a fully 'concrete' content to the work of Jesus as God-man both in the Gospel and world history.

The Gospel is both teaching and 'witness'[597] in the sense that it portrays both ethical commands that may be objectivised as ethical teaching while at the same time those ethical commands serve as a witness to the nature of the Absolute Person Jesus Christ. Men continues his exposition of Trubetskoi's thought by referring to the final part of Trubetskoi's *Teaching of the Logos,* where he relates Christ's absolute Messianic consciousness back to the kenotic quality of Christ's earthly ministry and to the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53.

[593] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 444.
[594] Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий. 96,117-30.
[595] Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий. 97-103,105.
[596] Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий. 103.
[597] Мень А.прот. Как читать библию. Часть третья. 371.

Christ's prophecies concerning his own sufferings are neither a legend created by early Christian communities to explain the soteriological significance of Golgotha, nor something that materialised late in Christ's ministry as the result of a fatalistic interpretation of his conflict with the priests and teachers of the Law.[598] The sufferings are themselves a fundamental part of the witness to the Person of Christ. Men summarises in the following way. "We do not know when the Father revealed to Him His will, but this will itself is connected with the new understanding of the Messiah as Redeemer and Saviour (Isaiah 53)".[599] He further cites Trubetskoi to this effect.

> Permeated with His Messianism, His faith in the Father and the consciousness of His providence and omnipotence, He judges all worldly fear; He believes in the miracle of God and the Kingdom of God, as coming miraculously and suddenly. In such conditions His death could present itself to Him as inescapable. And this is proven to us decisively by everything that we know about Christ and His relationship to His life and death; it was like this right to the end, as we see from the prayer about the cup in Gethsemane.[600]

Christ's death is therefore the ultimate witness to His ethical nature and the ethical content of the Kingdom.

Trubetskoi's emphatic assertion of the absolute nature of the Person of Christ, his God-consciousness and divine-humanity, leads to an equally emphatic assertion of the redemptive nature of Christ's suffering and death. As we saw in our discussion of Trubetskoi's letters to Harnack above, these were key points of contention with the latter. The way that Trubetskoi builds his christological account out of the Messianism and prophetism of the Old Testament against the backdrop of the pagan religious conceptions of antiquity, attributes greater authority to the Old Testament accounts than Harnack is willing to, while allowing him to ground his ontology of Old Testament history in the Person of Christ. It is clear from Men's

[598] Men refers to Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 478.
[599] Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том третий. 272-3.
[600] Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том третий. 273. Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 479.

'religious histories' that his sympathies lie with Trubetskoi in this respect.

3.4.4) Aleksandr Men's Divine-human account of Jesus Christ in *Son of Man*

The tenth chapter of *Son of Man. The Mystery of the Son of Man,* presents us with Men's most extended christological reflection, and given our discussion above, it should come as no surprise that this christology has much in common with that of Trubetskoi, with whose christological conceptions he was very well acquainted. Its use of John's Gospel is extensive, and the concept of 'divine-humanity' is developed as something wholly new in the concrete Person of Christ. For Men, the first chapter of John demonstrates that this 'divine-humanity' is a revelation not only of the living God, but of human anthropology. This is in sharp contrast with the Old Testament, where the divine is incommensurable with the human, because of its teaching on holiness. Due to this, the Old Testament Church paid too high a price and fought too long against paganism to conceive of a prophet who maintained "I am in the Father and the Father is in me" (John 14:11). Thus both Men and Trubetskoi emphasised the originality of the Gospel depictions of Christ's 'God-consciousness' as a 'suffering Messiah'. Men presents Christ's Messianic call in terms of Elijah's vision of God at Horeb (1 Kings 19:11-13). If people were expecting a heavenly knight, pulverising his enemies, then the Messiah came, like Elijah's still small voice, as a Nazarene Carpenter. "People were waiting for a mighty Messiah and an awesome theophany, but the earth saw the God-man, humbled and taking earthly flesh and blood."[601]

Due to its kenotic nature, the incarnational dogma of divine-humanity is an idea so wild to the Jews that there is no chance that it could have been conceived by Paul, a Jew.[602]

[601] Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий. 184-5.
[602] Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий. 177-8.

Nonetheless, it is already implicitly present in the earliest of Paul's writings, refuting Harnack's claim that it was the result of the later work of "the Greek spirit" on "Jewish soil". The incarnational divine-humanity culminates at the Cross of Christ and Christ's blood is a divine-human sacrifice.[603] The inexplicable path of the suffering Messiah, fully expressing the embryonic divine-humanity of Isaiah 53,[604] through the Resurrection returns creation to the path foreordained from above. The divine-humanity's cosmological connections to the world-process requires disciples to embark on the way of the Cross for themselves. Romans 8:19 shows this divine-human understanding of redemption in Paul's theology. "For the creation waits with eager longing for the revealing of the children of God". In the tenth chapter of *Apostles,* Men speaks of Paul's divine-human theology.

> The being of Christ is revealed to the Apostle [Paul] not as something static, but in becoming. To begin with humiliated, He takes on messianic glory in the Resurrection; then His glory spreads to the whole of creation, right to the final day, when all cosmic powers will bow before Him. "When all things are subjected to him, then the Son himself will also be subjected to the one who put all things in subjection under him, so that God may be all in all".[605] Put differently, the God-man (although Paul did not use this word) brings nature and people, with whom He is bound with intimate ties, to that unspeakable existence, where the Divine Being reigns unchallenged, to the Kingdom of God.[606]

If the Old Testament sharply distinguishes the ethical challenges of the prophets from their eschatological ideas, the 'realized eschatology', if it may be called this, that Men and Trubetskoi see both in the Gospels and Paul's Epistles[607] combines ethics and eschatology into a divine-human synthesis, the Kingdom of God. The coming transfiguration of the world is not an 'escape' from the present one, but reveals the highest human purpose by the Spirit.[608] Thus Men finds divine-humanity both in the Gospels and Paul, following similar isagogical and methodological positions to Trubetskoi. Men shows its implications to be broadly

---

603 Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий. 255.
604 The Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53 has a 'divine-human' role, Мень А.прот. Вестники..., 350.
605 1 Corinthians 15:28.
606 Мень А.прот. Первые апостолы. 246.
607 Men, Alexander, 'The Messianic Eschatology of St. Paul in Connexion with the Primitive Preaching of the Gospel'.
608 Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий. 179-183.

consistent with the cosmological christological notions of Solov′ev, who stood as the inspiration behind the writings of Trubetskoi. All of this is, of course, a departure from Harnack's biblical thought, although conditioned in various ways by the polemic between Trubetskoi and Harnack.

3.5) The Philosophy of Sergei Trubetskoi and Aleksandr Men

Much has been said above about Trubetskoi's critique of Harnack's 'neo-Kantian' philosophical assumptions, which he believes lie hidden in the latter's historical methodology. Likewise, it should now be clear that one of the most significant points of contention between Trubetskoi and Men on the one hand, and Harnack on the other, was christology. Trubetskoi and Men both wished to see Christ as the 'God-man', taking the Chalcedonian doctrine and the Gospel accounts together as their point of departure, whereas Harnack saw this conception as the work of the 'Greek spirit' on the soil of the pure Gospel. If, for Harnack, the most we could say about Jesus Christ was that He was the highest of humans, then, Trubetskoi and Men both saw in Harnack's caution not objective rational analysis, but the unwelcome insertion of certain philosophical assumptions into the matter of determining the identity of the Person of Christ, the Absolute Person.

Much of Trubetskoi's written work constituted an attempt to establish an alternative philosophical basis for understanding the world, one that could make sense of faith in the 'God-man', the Person of Christ. We consider this 'concrete idealism' as set out in *Foundations of Idealism* below, but first we consider two prior stages in Trubetskoi's philosophical thinking, his sophiology and his study of Greek philosophy, as this will illuminate some aspects of Men's theological thought. With respect to Trubetskoi's

sophiology it will be helpful to consider both Trubetskoi's own later reworking of these ideas in the light of Scriptural texts and the relation of Men to Bulgakov's sophiology, perhaps the most developed and theologically astute representative of this theologoumenon.

3.5.1) Sophiology and Logology

One intriguing aspect of Men's thinking that immediately seems to demand questioning is his unequivocal rejection of the sophiological thought of both Solov′ev and Bulgakov, despite his acknowledged debt to the writings of both. Furthermore, it is clear that this is not simply for reasons of ecclesial obsequience or in order to smooth the way for apologetics. In the interview entitled *Vladimir Solov'ev and the Russian Religious Renaissance* he states in answer to the question,[609] "how do you rate the theology of Fr. Sergius Bulgakov?", the following.

> In Fr. Sergius Bulgakov I value first of all the ideas of his early period, about the humanization of nature, about the creative calling of humanity, about the necessity of realising the Gospel in social life.[610] His analysis of apophatic theology (*Unfading Light*) is rich in ideas, as is his trilogy. But in general his works from Paris seem to me verbose, stylised and gnostic. He writes about hidden things too straightforwardly, too kataphatically. This gnosticism (including his sophiology) is alien to me. It hangs in the air, not supporting itself on the Scriptures nor on the mind.

The next question is "Which expressions of the system of Vladimir Solov′ev are alien to you and why?"

> His apocalyptic motifs are the most distant of all. And the idea of theocracy on earth. [n.b. Men's own views on apocalyptic themes are closer to those of Bulgakov, see 3.6.2] This was a result of his time.

[609] Бычков С.С. Хроника нераскрытого убийства. 172.

[610] This refers to *Two Cities* (Булгаков С.Н. Два града. Исследования о природе общественных идеалов. СПб.: Издательство Олега Абышко, 2008), *Quiet Thoughts* (Булгаков С.Н. Тихие думы. Этика, культура, софиология. СПб.: Издательство Олега Абышко, 2008) and Bulgakov's first major theological work Философия хозяйство, which polemicises with Marxism.

The most valuable thing in him is the idea of synthesis, "unified knowledge", that embraces all areas of knowledge, in general the breadth of his thought. Neither his sophiology nor any other [sophiology] ever attracted me. His experience of Sophia can be interpreted as a temptation.

Men believes that in the thought of Solov′ev, sophiology is a temptation, whereas in the thought of Bulgakov, it is related to excessively kataphatic theologising. Yet at the same time Men is completely happy to speak of the existence of a World Soul,[611] and rely on ideas of 'all-unity' and 'divine-humanity', which are closely connected with the sophiological structures of both Solov′ev and Bulgakov. Although Men explicitly rejected sophiological terminology, his appropriation of much of the sophiological metaphysical framework in his own thought has led some commentators to suggest the existence of a 'shadow sophiology' in Men's thinking. Thus Evgenii Rashkovskii writes on this.

Unfortunately, Fr. Aleksandr did not value and did not sufficiently emphasise the metaphysical power and heuristic worth of this Solov′evian idea-term. In conversations with me he complained, not without basis, of the excessive occult overcrowding of this idea of Solov′ev. At the same time specifically the 'sophianic' problem always troubled Fr. Aleksandr, the problem of pervasive and organising forces of nature, history and the human soul. And he related with total seriousness to the biblical problem, set out in Proverbs, of the highest, divinely-established and always implicit 'sophianic' sense of the universe and human life.[612]

Men's relation to Bulgakov's sophiology seems rather ambiguous in his lectures on the philosopher. He certainly did not have much sympathy with Vladimir Lossky's criticisms. His account of the 1930s 'Bulgakov affair' in his 1989 lecture shows his allegiances. He portrayed it as a purely political attempt to discredit the most significant theologian of the Russian Exarchate.

Such an enormous mind indisputably raised a mass of controversial questions. He was vulnerable like any major figure. Only the idiot is invulnerable, who speaks only commonplace truths: two times two is four. How can someone be vulnerable in this? But the one who raises questions is of course vulnerable! And a stream of criticism fell on Bulgakov. A monarchist of the Karlovatskii Synod living

[611] Мень А.прот. Истоки религии. 116. Men, Alexander, *The Wellsprings of Religion,* 122. MacNaughton translates Мировая душа as 'Universal Spirit'.

[612] Рашковский Е.Б. Владимир Соловьёв и протоиерей Александр Мень в динамике истории российской – Соловьевские исследования. Выпуск № 2(30)/2011, 32-44,39.

abroad wrote a thick tome about Bulgakov's sophiology.... I myself am distant from this teaching, I never accepted it, but I recognise that this conception has its place as a theological point of view.... Even the Paris theologian Vladimir Lossky, then still a sincere young man, who was always faithful to our Moscow Patriarchate, joined in this polemic and wrote an accusatory book about Bulgakov's sophiology. Later Lossky himself was ashamed of this book.[613]

Men was personally acquainted with a number of Bulgakov's 'spiritual children', most significantly the nun and iconographer Ioanna Reitlinger, with whom he conducted a substantial correspondence throughout the 1970s and 80s. He wrote to her concerning the relative merits of the theological thought of Bulgakov and Florovsky. "In the West his [Bulgakov's] authority defers to the authority of Florovsky. But he [Florovsky] is far less deep and sooner looks backwards than forwards."[614] One of his most extended reflections on the sophiological thought of Bulgakov also comes in these letters.

I by no means deny sophiology. Simply it goes beyond the limits of my thinking, beyond the boundaries of my meagre experience. And in general Fr. Sergius had a great love for dogmatic theology, whereas I do not have the taste for it. One of the reasons is completely elementary. I am used to knowing and remembering how many mysteries there are in the natural world. A natural-scientific yeast taught me metaphysical modesty. When I am cross-examined, for example, about the *filioque* or the Immaculate Conception, I ask: do we know how life was formed from molecules of protein, or how bats breed? No. Then how can we aspire to "analyse" these kinds of mystery? Where is the tool for this? The mind and logic? But they cannot be applied here to the end. Revelation? But it does not speak clearly about these mysteries. In this way dogmatic constructions are something deeply problematic. I don't know where to find support when I enter this area. Moreover, I hold that my knowledge in this sphere is insufficient to judge someone, all the more someone of the the substance of Fr. S.B.: I basically engage in theology for others. I simply believe that truth is with God, and it surpasses my understanding, and it is marvellous. Personally for me this is enough (this relates to, for example, the problem of evil). I am not infrequently accused of rationalism, but I am really quite distant from it. And in the first place I put faith, faith that is the only thing capable of saving us.[615]

Two basic points may be made on the basis of these citations. First, Men valued the process of honest theological questioning, and had little time for those who stifled it (in his view V.N. Lossky and G.V. Florovsky).[616] Second, despite this, Men saw Bulgakov's sophiology as an entirely unnecessary metaphysical departure. In the views stated here on the relationship

[613] Мень А.прот. Русская религиозная философия, 286-287.
[614] Умное небо, 311.
[615] Умное небо, 306-7.
[616] Men's positive account of Socratic method as a 'critical' process, that "left behind the soil of blind faith in tradition" is enlightening: Мень А.прот. Дионис, Логос, Судьба, 191.

between the centrality of faith, the role of dogmatic theology and the revelation of Scripture, there is a curious mix of emphases. In seeing dogma as problematic, he seems to follow Harnack. Yet it is quite clear at the same time that the method for dealing with this problem does not lie in scientific analysis, but in God Himself. As in Trubetskoi's account of Luther (3.3), it is faith that has the central anthropological epistemological role, and we should trust in God, treating metaphysical constructions with caution, rather than outright rejection. If Harnack smuggled unacknowledeged metaphysics into his account of the history of dogma, Bulgakov's 'kataphatic' problem is rather different.

A thorough investigation of Bulgakov's sophiology is beyond the scope of this study[617] as it takes us too far from the matter of biblical interpretation. Bulgakov's most explicit reflections on biblical interpretation, such as in the first chapter of his book *Orthodoxy,* and in parts of *Unfading Light* do not link it to his sophiological theories.[618] Suffice to say that the most obvious influence of these on his approach to biblical interpretation may be found in his theological accounts of Creation and the eschatological conceptions of the book of Revelation.[619] Men is able to recreate many of the theological positions of Bulgakov without recourse to his sophiological framework in *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life* and certain other works (the *besedy* on Revelation, for example). Men's interpretations of these passages will be discussed in 3.6. That Men can do this is undoubtedly because Bulgakov's interest in both the doctrine of creation and eschatology actually pre-dated his interest in sophiology. His earlier works pay greater attention to Trubetskoi's biblical theology and carry

[617] Valliere, Paul, *Modern Russian Theology*, 227-371, Ваганова Н.А. Софиология протоиерея Сергия Булгакова. М.: Издательство ПСТГУ, 2011 provide this. From a biblical perspective, Bulgakov's sophiology is an extended reflection on Proverbs 8:22-36. It forms a framework for Bulgakov's doctrine of creation, doctrine of God, christology, pneumatology, ecclesiology and eschatology. His first explicitly 'sophiological' work is *Philosophy of Economy* (Философия хозяйство) (1912), and *Unfading Light* (1917) retain Solov′ev's doctrinally problematic conceptions of the 'Eternal Feminine'. The most developed sophiological doctrinal system is found in Bulgakov's Great Trilogy: *On The Divine-Humanity* (1933,1936,1945). Men is not very interested in Bulgakov's attempts to identify creaturely Sophia with Palamite "energies" (*The Lamb of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008)*,* 116-17).

[618] Bulgakov, Sergius, *Unfading Light,* 98-100, 390-391.

[619] These are primarily in *The Lamb of God* and *The Bride of the Lamb* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002).

over the latter's suspicion of Solov′ev's sophiology. Articles in the collection *Two Cities* (1910), which Men considered Bulgakov's most interesting pre-revolutionary work,[620] demonstrate this clearly. The works of this early 'idealist' period (c.1900-1910) of Bulgakov's creativity show great interest not only in Solov′ev and Schelling, but in Trubetskoi's so-called 'concrete idealism' (3.5.2).

Bulgakov, however, was not aware of Trubetskoi's unpublished early treatise on sophiology, and progressively moved in the opposite direction to Trubetskoi, rejecting the latter's attempts to rework idealist philosophy in favour of an elaborate dogmatic sophiology. Vaganova, in her extensive Russian-language study of Bulgakov's sophiology, makes an intriguing comment.

> In the years 1885-6 S.N. Trubetskoi's work "On The Holy Wisdom of God" was written, a work which was considered lost and found only recently by I.V. Basin.[621] It was undoubtedly inspired by the conception of Solov′ev, more precisely it was an attempt at the construction of an alternative, more Orthodox sophiological teaching. For Trubetskoi the Sophia of gnostic sects was false and sinful precisely because it was taken by them to be a principle of knowledge, gnosis, an idiosyncratic ladder of salvation that might be climbed rationally, but not universal Sophia, the Church. Here are basically already set down the perspectives for an ontological examination of Sophia, that will later be characteristic also for Bulgakov.[622]

This early work of Trubetskoi, unknown to both Bulgakov and Men, was his first attempt at creating a philosophical basis for the Christian faith, founded upon Slavophile ideas. For his later works, Trubetskoi left behind many of these ideas, including his sophiological conceptions, preferring a detailed analysis of Greek and biblical thought. He did not reject metaphysics, but reworked it in such a way that Men may well have attributed 'metaphysical modesty' to him. Trubetskoi rejected 'sophiology' for a 'logology', but without rejecting Solov′ev's philosophy of all-unity, as he believed this to be the most faithful way of

---

620 Мень А.прот. Русская религиозная философия, 272.
621 Трубецкой С.Н. О святой Софии, Премудрости Божией – Вопросы философии. 1995, № 9. 120-168.
622 Ваганова Н.А. Софиология протоиерея Сергия Булгакова. 268-9.

expressing Biblical and Patristic thought.

In the later *Teaching of the Logos,* Trubetskoi does what is conspicuously lacking in Bulgakov's sophiological writing. He conducts a systematic examination of the biblical texts that refer to 'Wisdom', including a 'scientific' analysis of their conceptual context. If, in his earlier, work, he contrasts, like Bulgakov, the ecclesial nature of 'wisdom' with the gnosticism of speculative philosophy and the heresies of the early Church, it is clear that later he became dissatisfied with this attempt to define the 'Holy Sophia' of the early church against the 'gnosticism' of early Christian sectarianism. 'Sophia' is not an external vantage point from which to observe the 'tragedy of philosophy', but one way in which the Old Testament chooses to talk about the character of God's action in the world (as the Hebrew term *hokma*), together with the associated terms 'spirit' (*ruach*) and 'word' (*davar*, later translated into Greek as *logos*).[623] Trubetskoi charts the gradual development of the semantic implications of this term from 'everyday' wisdom responsible for good management of the household, through to wisdom as the source of artistic expression, and something necessary for kings such as Solomon. Wisdom is connected with the Law. It is wise instruction in the way of life and in this way the term *hokma* denotes the way in which "human wisdom is raised up to its divine source". Men follows Trubetskoi's account thus far in *Threshold.*[624] This sentiment is not too far from the ideas that lie at the heart of Bulgakov's sophiology, but they do not receive the same metaphysical reworking and in the end are fully subjugated to Trubetskoi's logology with its teleology.

---

[623] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 283-293.

[624] Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета книга I, 173. Unlike Bulgakov, Men uses the Russian *premudrost'* rather than the Greek *sophia* to translate the Hebrew *hokma*. In Proverbs "on the one hand it is a quality of the human mind, on the other it is to be identified with 'order' or 'constitution', in particular with that which helps the king rule the country, and for the ordinary person, with that which helps run a family and household." For the ancient Israelites this consisted of knowledge imported from surrounding nations with a greater level of development. It is a non-esoteric gift from God, open to all and not simply from other people. It comes to be identified with an ethical world order that finds its source not in itself or in humanity, but in the Creator God: "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom" (Proverbs 9:10).

It [Wisdom] is not the result of subjective intellectualizing, it was with God in the beginning; through it everything was created, through it the beginning and end of creation is determined, through it Israel is led towards its providential purpose. It comes from the "unsearchable understanding" of God (Isaiah 40:28).[625]

It can be seen from the structure of this citation that Trubetskoi brings together the Wisdom (*hokma*) of God with both the Logos of John 1 that was "with God in the beginning" and Isaiah's "unsearchable understanding" of God. He cites Proverbs 8, which, as Men also recognises, is the starting point of a biblical account of sophiology (vs.14-15, 22-25, 27-28a, 29-31).

I have good advice and sound wisdom; I have insight, I have strength. By me kings reign, and rulers decree what is just.… The Lord created me at the beginning of his work, the first of his acts of long ago. Ages ago I was set up, at the first, before the beginning of the earth. When there were no depths I was brought forth, when there were no springs abounding with water. Before the mountains had been shaped, before the hills, I was brought forth…. When he established the heavens, I was there, when he drew a circle on the face of the deep, when he made firm the skies above... when he assigned to the sea its limit, so that the waters might not transgress his command, when he marked out the foundations of the earth, then I was beside him, like a master worker; and I was daily his delight, rejoicing before him always, rejoicing in his inhabited world and delighting in the human race.[626]

While, as Trubetskoi notes, it is not entirely clear from this passage whether the author intends only a poetic representation or a real personality, it is clear from later developments of the wisdom literature genre that "Wisdom is undoubtedly hypostasised, as a particular power of God" not only in the 'non-canonical' books of the Bible, The Wisdom of Solomon and Ecclesiasticus, but Job 28.[627] There Wisdom "is providential power in the history of the universe and in the history of Israel, just as in the life of the individual human."[628]

Trubetskoi is clear that the Old Testament understandings of Spirit, Word and Wisdom are not

[625] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 290.
[626] Cited from the Synodal Bible in Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 290-1.
[627] Discussed in Ваганова Н.А. Софиология протоиерея Сергия Булгакова, 48-52, although curiously, she ignores Job 28.
[628] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 291

to be straightforwardly identified. He summarises this.

> God created the world with only His Word, only His Spirit, only His Wisdom. He called it from non-existence into existence by His Word, brought it to life by His Spirit, gave it a teleological structure by His Wisdom. And together He spoke His Word to humans and gave to them from His Spirit and His Wisdom. For faithful Israel, the Spirit, Word and Wisdom of Yhwh are first of all really experienced facts of life.[629]

Specifically on Wisdom, he tells us, "it is a property of God, and if it is portrayed as the first of the creations of Yhwh, then even there, where it seems it is distinguished most of all from Him, as in the Book of Wisdom, it is only portrayed as the 'breath of His power' (7:25): it is indistinguishable from the 'unsearchable mind' of God."[630] Like the Word and the Spirit it mediates revelation, but in it is expressed only divine self-revelation. Using Solov′evian terminology, Trubetskoi tells us that the best way of describing this dynamic relationship between the Word, Wisdom and Spirit is as the 'all-unity' of God. In the God-consciousness of Israel, there is dynamism and variety, but no fragmentation, no compromising of the unity of God. While Bulgakov also built on Solov′ev's ideas, it is clear from the above that his identification of this 'all-unity' with Sophia as the Integral Wisdom of God and divine essence in his *Great Trilogy*,[631] in a sense the foundational concept of the dynamic relationship between Wisdom, Word and Spirit, goes some way beyond what Trubetskoi believes may be legitimately founded on the biblical evidence.

Discussing the nature of Wisdom in Old Testament texts,[632] Men relates the conception of Wisdom to divine self-revelation, but he does not follow Bulgakov in identifying divine self-revelation with God's love for Sophia.[633] Men, like Trubetskoi, is not prepared to venture further than what he considers to be consistent with Scripture.

---

629 Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 292
630 Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 292. This is an allusion to Isaiah 40:28.
631 Bulgakov, Sergius, *The Lamb of God,* 203.
632 following Proverbs 8.
633 Bulgakov, Sergius, *The Lamb of God,* 204.

The essence of Wisdom is connected with the mystery of the *self-revelation* of God, which is the most important point of biblical theology. Asserting the unconditional supramundaneity of the Creator and His incomprehensibility, the Old Testament at the same time also knows about the Revelation of God to the world. Through this Revelation, or Self-manifestation, the Unutterable becomes knowable for human beings. The Creation of the world is itself already such an act of the departure of God from the infinite depth of supra-being. Entering into a Covenant with human beings, bringing them close to His fullness, Yhwh reveals Himself to creatures. His voice, addressed to the prophet, is a fiery pillar,[634] a heavenly chariot,[635] a cloud in the temple;[636] all these are symbols of theophany, which makes possible divine-human [bogochelovecheskii] history. One of the first representations of Divine appearance in the Bible... is the Angel of the Lord, which is as though God Himself, but diminished for the purposes of becoming accessible to humans.[637] After this, this concrete representation is replaced in the Bible by three principal Theophanies: *The Word, the Spirit and the Wisdom of Yhwh.*[638] They comprise a unity in God. But at the same we see that the Word is predominantly the creating God, the Spirit His life-creating power, and Wisdom the organiser of the Universe.[639]

Men uses Trubetskoi's *Teaching of the Logos* as his primary source for interpreting the interrelated biblical presentations of "The Word, the Spirit and the Wisdom of Yhwh". "In Orthodox literature it is the most coherent presentation of teachings concerning the biblical theophanies",[640] he claims. For Men, as for Trubetskoi, it is difficult to precisely delineate the boundary between the Word and the Wisdom of God on scriptural evidence alone, even in the Old Testament. On the Wisdom of Solomon, Men refers to Trubetskoi's discussion of the book. "In one case the wise man even directly calls it [wisdom] Logos, the Word of God, but just as in Proverbs, here there is not yet a teaching about the Trinity, but ancient understandings of the Glory and Angel of Yhwh as representations of divine appearance in the Universe are in development."[641] Both see these Old Testament teachings as a kind of 'proto-Trinitarianism' and both are aware that it leads to much Patristic thinking on the question of how the Wisdom and Word are related in the Person of Christ. Men remarks that if Wisdom is a kind of mediator through which God brings his will to fulfilment, then nothing

634 Exodus 13:21-22.
635 2 Kings 2:11-12.
636 2 Chronicles 5:13-14.
637 Bulgakov, Sergius, *Jacob's Ladder: On Angels,* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010).
638 Discussed in *Teaching of the Logos* (Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 283-291). Men has 291 in mind here, where the three are referred to together.
639 Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета книга I, 182.
640 Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета книга I, 400з.243
641 Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета книга II, 117. Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 127-129.

prevents extending it to include a still broader cosmic sense. "The fates of humans are part of the general fate of creation, and the whole Universe rests on the will and plan of the Creator. Therefore the author of the Book of Proverbs sees in the Wisdom of God a power organising the cosmos"[642] that stands against chaos. The wisdom writers avoid pantheism by refusing to see the order of the cosmos as a source of itself; just as humans are dependent on God for the gift of wisdom, nature is dependent on God for its ordering.[643] For this reason, it would be unhelpful to claim, as Bulgakov does, that Wisdom is the divine essence (*ousia)*.[644] Wisdom has a role in creation (Proverbs 3:19-20), but it is not the Creator Himself.

Having followed Trubetskoi's account of the scriptural concept in outline, Men asks whether Wisdom is to be understood as the 'World soul', the 'idea of the cosmos' or 'a structural power of God'. This discussion is clearly in response to Bulgakov, who saw Wisdom, Sophia, in precisely this way.[645] Although the world was never considered inert or dead in the Bible, there is little evidence to suggest that 'Wisdom' is to be identified with this living, spiritual force. "Scripture clearly enough shows Wisdom to be something participating in God." It cannot be the connecting link between Creator and creation that Bulgakov and others claim it to be. "Such an exegesis leaves biblical soil",[646] since it contradicts such statements as "I came forth from the mouth of the Most High" (Ecclesiasticus 24:3). Bulgakov is correct to claim that Wisdom is connected with the mystery of divine self-revelation, but his kataphatic approach does not do justice to the Old Testament portrayal of the otherness of God.[647]

Perhaps it is telling that despite the connection between divine self-revelation and the

[642] Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета книга I, 177.
[643] Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета книга I, 178.
[644] For example, in *The Lamb of God,* 103
[645] The 'World Soul' is discussed in *The Bride of the Lamb,* 79-102.
[646] Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета книга I, 181-2.
[647] Men cites E. Trubetskoi, Zenkovskii and Knyazev in his discussion, but in reality he is much indebted to S. Trubetskoi: Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета книга I, 178з.241.

doctrine of the inspiration of Scripture, Bulgakov was reticent about providing an explicitly sophiological account of the divine inspiration of Scripture. While his account of divine inspiration in *Orthodoxy* does emphasise the role of the Spirit in the Church,[648] something that is separately given a sophiological interpretation in *The Bride of the Lamb,*[649] Negrov's claim that for Bulgakov, "human writers with human faculties were divinely illuminated as they partook of the divine Sophia – God's revelation in the world"[650] is reading between the lines. Due to this clear separation between Bulgakov's sophiological thinking and his approach to scriptural interpretation, Men felt free to cite Bulgakov on the nature of Scripture in his article *Concerning the History of Russian Orthodox Biblical Studies* while rejecting his sophiology. As noted previously, for Men the most interesting aspects of Bulgakov's use of the Bible related to his attempts to give an account of Creation and Eschatology, which, in such early works as the *Philosophy of Economy,* were directly related to a critique of Marxism (3.6). Men was no doubt aware that many of the characteristics of Bulgakov's hermeneutics noted by Negrov may be found in the writings of Solov′ev, Trubetskoi and other, earlier, figures.[651] With respect to the contours of his overall approach to Scripture, Men had more in common with Trubetskoi's development of Solov′ev's ideas, even if Bulgakov's views on Creation and Eschatology had certain implications for the challenges of his Soviet context. Following Trubetskoi, he developed a 'logology' that could reconcile the christological teaching both of Scripture and of the Fathers with Solov′ev's philosophy of all-unity.

---

[648] Булгаков, С.прот. Очерки учения православной Церкви. Спб.: Издательство Олега Абышко, 2011, 14-32.

[649] Bulgakov, Sergius, *The Bride of the Lamb,* 254-267.

[650] Negrov, Alexander, 'Fr. Sergius Bulgakov (1871-1944): A study in the Eastern Orthodox hermeneutical perspective'. *HTS Teologiese Studies* 58(1) 2002, 250-263: 252.

[651] Concerning the nature of Scripture and the role of 'scientific' study, see the original Предуведомление to Solov′ev's *History and Future of Theocracy* (2.2.2) and the ecclesial aspect of interpretation was earlier discussed by Khomyakov: Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том третий. 355-357. Negrov's article is helpful in emphasising the role of Bulgakov's pneumatology in biblical interpretation. Bulgakov's considers this matter more seriously than in any prior study, but Men does not engage with this.

A fitting conclusion to this discussion of Men's views on sophiology may be found in his account of Wisdom in the Brussels Bible commentary on Proverbs 8, since there Men summarises the Old Testament account of Divine Wisdom, before assessing it in light of the New Testament, especially the 'logology' of John's Gospel. According to Men, Wisdom is initially seen as a gift of God, but later personified, and its pretemporal origins and participation in the creation of the world are accentuated not only in Proverbs 8-9, but Ecclesiasticus and the Wisdom of Solomon. Clearly following Trubetskoi he writes concerning this.[652]

> In all the texts, however, where Wisdom is personified, as are in other places the Spirit and the Word, it is difficult to set a sharp dividing line between poetic images as expressions of ancient religious perspectives, and the enlightenment of new Revelation. The teaching concerning Wisdom, set out in its most important outlines in the Old Testament, was transferred to the New Testament, where in the light of the new, perfect Revelation of primordial Wisdom, an active participant in the creation of the world, it was identified with God as the Word, the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, Who from the beginning "was with God" and without Whom "not one thing came to be that came to be"[653] (John 1:1-3, see also Hebrews 1:2, Revelation 3:14).[654]

Men further supports this identification with New Testament texts that call Christ either 'Wisdom' or 'the Wisdom of God' (Matthew 11:19, Luke 11:49, Matthew 23:34-36, 1 Cor. 1:24-30).

This identification, although not wholly clear in the Old Testament texts, is nonetheless not an arbitrary aspect of the christological teaching of the Fathers, but crucial to the salvific efficacy of the Gospel narratives. It is a fundamental truth revealed only with the coming of Christ and achieved in the Person of Christ. Since Christ as the Logos is the Wisdom of the Old Testament, then the Incarnation has implications for the world process. Christ has taken part in the creation and preservation of the world (Col. 1:16-17), just as Wisdom is alleged to

[652] This is a good argument for Men's authorship of these anonymous commentaries.
[653] Translated from John 1:3 of Russian Synodal Bible.
[654] Brussels Bible commentary on Proverbs 8: 22-31.

have done in Proverbs 8.

> The creation of humans as the image and likeness God (Genesis 1:26-28, Proverbs 8:30-31) was the completion and purpose of creation and a particular subject of participation in the joy of Wisdom, just as the purpose of the Incarnation of the Son of God is the deification of humanity, "the salvation of the perishing" (Matthew 18:11, Luke 19:10), the gift of eternal life and perfect joy to every believer in Him (John 3:16, 17:13). All this is explained by the fact that the Fathers of the Church, beginning with Justin Martyr, recognised Christ in Old Testament Wisdom.[655]

This is perhaps the most conclusive rejection of Bulgakov's sophiology to be found in Men's writings. In the final analysis the acceptance or rejection of sophiology is not merely a matter of dogmatic opinion, whatever Men may have claimed in his letter to Reitlinger. Bulgakov's sophiology, albeit unintentionally, undermined the link between the Gospel narrative of divine incarnation and the soteriological teaching of the Church. In establishing this criticism, Men drew on Trubetskoi's account of biblical Wisdom, thus lending his interpretation of both the Gospel narratives and the Old Testament a more concentrated christocentricity than may be found in many 'Russian school' approaches to the biblical texts. Although devoid of the metaphysical density of Bulgakov's theologoumenon, Men's scriptural, 'logological' account of Wisdom produced one of the themes that unify the biblical narrative under the Person of Jesus Christ from the creation of the world to final eschatological revelation, alongside 'covenant' and others (2.1.3.1). This account of Wisdom built on the prophetic literature of the Old Testament, which was an expression of it, and thus christology became a critique of the 'fatalistic' eschatologies prevalent in the various apocryphal writings of first-century Palestine. Following Trubetskoi, it is these eschatologies that are responsible for early Christian gnostic sectarianism, not Harnack's 'Greek spirit'.[656]

---

[655] Brussels Bible commentary on Proverbs 8: 22-31.

[656] Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том третий. 271, Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе. 400.

3.5.2) Greek thought and 'Concrete Idealism'

This 'logological' christological account is closely connected with Trubetskoi's philosophy, especially the strongly 'personalist' aspects of his concrete idealism. Although at the time of his work *Metaphysics in Ancient Greece,* his 'concrete idealism' was yet to be fully realised, the methodological introduction to this work is of considerable interest. There he writes,

> Greek metaphysics is for us a connective, organic whole, which, in comparison with later revealed intellectual structures, are fundamental, but at the same time the most simple and elemental. Therefore the study of classical philosophy lies at the basis of any study of philosophy, at the basis of all correct philosophical education.[657]

With these words it becomes clear that what Trubetskoi has in mind is no straightforward 'history' of Ancient Greek thought; it is better described as an attempt to hold up the metaphysical conceptions of Ancient Greece as a mirror to those of his contemporaries who might be tempted to denigrate the significance of 'metaphysics'. Thus, we read about those who wish to prove the impossibility of metaphysics *a priori,* such as Kantians, who maintain that even if such a realm is theoretically possible, it cannot be known. Then we read about those who use 'empirical psychology' to prove the impossibility of metaphysics *a posteriori,* since in this case human knowledge is held to be conditioned exclusively by sensual experience.[658]

In response to the latter *a posteriori* proof and in words reminiscent of his defence of metaphysics in his letters to Harnack, Trubetskoi argues that metaphysics does not only have an 'external' history, but an 'inner significance' as a unified logical process of human thinking concerned with the knowledge of the truth. This is because "in our consciousness

[657] Трубецкой С.Н. Метафизика в Древней Греции. 1.
[658] Трубецкой С.Н. Метафизика в Древней Греции. 3.

there is something that is not explicable by any experience, by anything coming from outside."[659] As such, metaphysics is best thought of as an image or an icon of human searching. This claim should remind us of Trubetskoi's second letter to Harnack (3.3) where he claims that Russians think in terms of images, not dogma. Both Trubetskoi and Men set histories of ancient thought before us not as straightforward 'histories' intended to establish an 'objective' historiographical method, but as an icon or 'symbol' through which divine truth may be apprehended. The success of such an endeavour is bound to depend on the reader as much as on the written word, therefore involving a 'hermeneutical circle'. If we do not recognise this iconographic significance of history, then our critical inquiry is destined to become only one pole of the dialectic in an ongoing 'external' metaphysical development. As Trubetskoi claims in response to the *a priori* proof, attempts to do away with metaphysics are unable to avoid letting it in through the back door, disguised only by its negative form.[660] Men's criticism of Harnack's historical method (3.2) runs very close to this.

In defending metaphysics, Trubetskoi introduces two conceptions that will later be important to him in *Foundations of Idealism:* 'relationship' and 'faith' (n.b. we discussed the significance of faith in his letters to Harnack in 3.3).

> Every appearance as relationship or action, in the power of the law of relation itself, necessarily assumes something that relates, appears, and in this way, human consciousness in every relationship as though goes out of itself into the metaphysical sphere, in every appearance it enters into a relationship with that which appears. Only on this hangs the true and universal unshakeable faith in the reality of the world, in the reality of all being; for without this kind of faith not one being could distinguish the subjective from the true, genuine being. This basic conviction in the reality of being sets the stage for consciousness itself and completely conditions it. But what is this being (τί τὸ ὄν)? This is the basic question of metaphysics. Therefore, if I say that being is an appearance, then I make a statement just as metaphysical as the one who says that being is God, matter, spirit or power, for the unconditional idea of being, by itself, is completely metaphysical, which is accepted by all; along with this it is unconditionally necessary, as logical analysis clearly shows.[661]

[659] Трубецкой С.Н. Метафизика в Древней Греции. 14. At 17з.1 the moment of self-consciousness is above temporal distinction, inviting comparison with Schleiermacher's discussion of the relationship between the "feeling of absolute dependence" and self-consciousness: *The Christian Faith,* 21-23.

[660] Трубецкой С.Н. Метафизика в Древней Греции. 4.

[661] Трубецкой С.Н. Метафизика в Древней Греции. 5-6.

On this basis, even materialism is metaphysical, in a similar manner to Christianity, and just as dependent on its own kind of 'relationship' and 'faith'. This claim of Trubetskoi becomes foundational for Bulgakov in his critique of Marxism in the *Philosophy of Economy*[662] and Men's implicit critique of Marxism in *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life* (also, 3.6.2).

The problem of metaphysics is incontrovertibly bound up with the nature of human consciousness; it may be ignored, but it cannot be successfully avoided. Thus, states Trubetskoi, "the subject goes out of itself metaphysically, in a general sense, in every act of apprehension, knowing, or consciousness, in every act of its life, in every one of its relationships."[663] Clarifying, he states, "I go out of myself metaphysically, ideally."[664] Therefore this metaphysical beginning is everywhere at work and an essential aspect of any epistemology. It is not the exotic product of scholastic philosophical imagination, but 'faith' in it is the fundamental requirement for the business of everyday life. In this sense all philosophy should be 'idealist', but it should avoid the useless abstractions of the 'idealist' philosophers. Kant's ideal 'thing-in-itself' (*Ding an sich*) is a wholly unnecessary conception, a product of 'subjective anthropomorphism', because the implied denial of any kind of real relationship with this 'thing-in-itself' turns it into a self-enclosed abstraction of little practical value, a mere relic of 'substance'.[665] This criticism of Kant is developed further in *Foundations of Idealism,* where the 'thing-in-itself' is regarded as an absurd proposition, since "substance is appearance, and recognising this appearance as real independently of our limited subject means only to see in it an object of common knowledge, common sensuality,

[662] "Being does not exist *in abstracto*, but is only concrete being for itself, self-affirming life" (Философия хозяйства 34) Bulgakov also discusses Trubetskoi's definition of metaphysics as "the critical science concerned with being or the systematic ideology of being" (Философия хозяйства 53).
[663] Трубецкой С.Н. Метафизика в Древней Греции, 15.
[664] Трубецкой С.Н. Метафизика в Древней Греции, 23.
[665] Трубецкой С.Н. Метафизика в Древней Греции, 25, Основания идеализма, 704.

conditioned by a subject of a higher order."[666] In contrast, claims Trubetskoi, the phenomenal appearance must therefore be the 'thing-outside-itself', which may be identified with Aristotle's 'metaphysical act'.[667]

In *Foundations of Idealism,* Trubetskoi devotes roughly the first half of his treatise to a critique of the various idealist and empiricist philosophies current in the nineteenth century, paying particular attention to Kant and Hegel. He then starts to develop his own conceptions, building on some of the ideas from his *Introduction* to *Metaphysics in Ancient Greece.* Faith again plays a key epistemological role. It is immanent to consciousness,[668] cannot be analytically separated from sense and thought,[669] and therefore must be seen as a factor in all knowing. It is the 'third factor' in our knowing, and as such leads us "to a new understanding of the inner identity of object and subject".[670] Faith in the external reality of unconditioned matter is a necessary part of knowing, yet at the same time it is a transcendent factor that cannot withstand philosophical criticism.[671] In a section entitled *Critique of Mystical Idealism*, Trubetskoi gives an intriguing account of the role of faith in the epistemological approaches of Eastern religions. This serves as a prelude to introducing his own christocentric version of 'faith' and as such presents us with a model for Men's work on Eastern religions, *At the Gates of Silence.* Mysticism is faith in being itself as a spiritual source or an unmediated apprehension of being. It fails to leave room not only for rational criticism, but even the possibility of false belief. It is a possible way of structuring knowledge that can be found in any culture, and Christians can easily fall back into this inadequate and

[666] Трубецкой С.Н. Основания идеализма, 667. This reflects Hegel's conception of Absolute Spirit. Later (706), Trubetskoi remarks on the positive aspects of Hegel's philosophy, the universal connectedness and real logical unity of things. Hegel's philosophy was, however, too abstract, claims Trubetskoi, and contradicted experiential knowledge. The Absolute became something abstract.

[667] Aristotle, *Metaphysics Book XII:* http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/metaphysics.12.xii.html [Accessed 26/05/2019].

[668] Трубецкой С.Н. Основания идеализма, 653.

[669] Трубецкой С.Н. Основания идеализма, 654-6.

[670] Трубецкой С.Н. Основания идеализма, 662.

[671] Трубецкой С.Н. Основания идеализма, 665.

impersonal account of knowledge. Trubetskoi and Men adopt an ambivalent attitude towards some forms of Eastern Orthodox mysticism (3.4.2), due to the lack of a linear account of revelatory history. Now from a philosophical rather than a historical perspective, Trubetskoi tells us concerning the relationship between mysticism and Christianity the following.

> Western European mysticism is determined, on the one hand, by philosophical neoplatonism, but on the other by the positive historical data of Christianity, the Gospel of Christ, His Person and ecclesial dogmas. Christianity with its universal character, can hardly be determined as a religion of 'unmediated' revelation and substantially differs from all kinds of mystical gnosticism. In any case mysticism is normalised in Christianity by several basic positive and objectives rules (1 John 4:1-3).[672] But, despite all these differences, in the West, as in the East, the one-sided development of mysticism in its striving to reach the supra-sensual, unmediated knowledge of being frequently led by an identical path to analogical results.[673]

These results were problematic because they tended to involve the denial both of a real plurality in being and concrete consciousness. The account of reality is fundamentally monistic and leaves little room for positive theoretical philosophy, and this is something which Trubetskoi sees as problematic. Given this, it seems clear that this is a fundamental reason why Trubetskoi would not have sympathised with Bulgakov's negative account of philosophical method in his *Tragedy of Philosophy* and his later attempts to ground his theology on Palamite thought.[674]

Metaphysics, Trubetskoi tells us, plays a critical role in analysing forms of knowledge, the conditions of experience, and the criteria required for appearances. This is required as a preliminary for understanding the spiritual source of the logically conditioned, knowing subject.[675] Although faith plays a significant epistemological role for Trubetskoi, one of the crucial characteristics of that faith is that it contains the immanent correlation of our spirit to

---

[672] This passage gives conditions for testing spirits.
[673] Трубецкой С.Н. Основания идеализма, 682.
[674] For example, Bulgakov's *Unfading Light,* 131, Труды о Троичности. М.: ОГИ, 2001, 249 and his later *The Bride of the Lamb,* 19.
[675] Трубецкой С.Н. Основания идеализма, 691.

reality. If we follow the path of mystical idealism then we cannot establish the real relationality necessary for faith, since we have denied both the plurality of being and concrete consciousness, thus we do not have access to the only thing capable of conditioning our thought and our apprehension of it. Thus, one of the most important aspects of 'concrete idealism' builds on Trubetskoi's emphasis on relationship in the *Introduction* to *Metaphysics in Ancient Greece.* The universal correlativity of being is recognised as a law. When this is not the case, we fall back into the false metaphysics of "materialism, dualism, abstract monism or monadology".[676] As Trubetskoi states, "in reality everything correlates, and 'to be' means to relate."[677] Building on the language of 'going out' from oneself used in *Metaphysics,* he tells us,

> this kind of correlativity conditions both the form and the content of my consciousness as limited being, and at the same time, in the consciousness itself of this correlation I go out beyond the boundaries of my subjective individuality and understand the universal all-unity [*vseedinstvo*] of being. For I logically connect my subjective states with real things and processes independently of my individual "I".[678]

All of this is somewhat reminiscent of the early stages of Heidegger's philosophical project, who sought in *Being and Time* "to work out the question of being, and do so concretely."[679] As Heidegger sought to critique those who had trivialized what the Greeks had 'wrested' from phenomena, Trubetskoi similarly wished to reevaluate and rethink the significance of Greek metaphysics.[680] Both were motivated by the need to provide a critique of the neo-Kantian philosophy that rejected ontology in favour of concepts. It is unsurprising, therefore, that the relatedness of Being and the inquirer, expressed in Heidegger's work by the term *Dasein* and Heidegger's analysis of *Dasein's* temporality, find parallels in Trubetskoi's

---

676 Трубецкой С.Н. Основания идеализма, 695.
677 Трубецкой С.Н. Основания идеализма, 696.
678 Трубецкой С.Н. Основания идеализма, 697-8. Bulgakov's Философия хозяйства 45 gives a similar discussion on epistemology.
679 Heidegger, Martin, *Being and Time,* translated Joan Stambaugh, (Albany NY: State University of New York Press, 2010), xxix.
680 Compare with Heidegger's attempts to reassess Greek thought in his *Introduction to Metaphysics* (1953).

reflections on ‘relationship’.

Trubetskoi, however, links the philosophical notion of relationship with a term that ultimately has not only ethical, but theological implications: ‘altruism’. “Without the relation of subject to object there is neither will, nor thought, nor feeling, nor consciousness; there is no actual and real subject. Only in its *altruism,*[681] in other words as existence *for everything else,* is the absolute the universal and actual absolute, embracing in itself the fullness of being.”[682] The absolute cannot be limited by any abstract determinations, as these determinations would always negate a plurality of concrete relationships. Therefore its true determination must be concrete,[683] as the actual bridge between the absolute and the relative, and in this way it shows the true all-unity of the absolute, which conditions the concrete correlativity of being. Trubetskoi develops this further. “The Absolute affirms itself only in its ‘altruism’, in other words affirming the potential of its other and revealing itself in its actuality, as a concrete, all-powerful and at the same time all-good and free will.”[684] In our own, human, subjects we have the “image and likeness of this universal, concrete all-unity.”[685] This ‘altruism’ at work in us makes our ‘metaphysical’ or ‘ideal’ going out of ourselves into something concrete. In other words, all of our knowing, in Trubetskoi's terminology, is both ‘ideal’ and ‘concrete’.

Due to this ‘altruism’ the absolute is not merely a logical subject to which we relate our idea of ‘all-unity’, but a real subject. Introducing the term ‘Logos’, Trubetskoi tells us that there is no such thing as an abstract, non-relational Logos, as an ‘absolute idea’. Thought can only be logical given the presumption of being and the true Logos is relational, concrete and

[681] Trubetskoi notes that he is using this term in an ontological, rather than ethical sense. This suggests the notion of ‘kenosis’, very important for Bulgakov throughout his *Great Trilogy*.
[682] Трубецкой С.Н. Основания идеализма, 708.
[683] Гайденко П.П. <Конкретный идеализм> С.Н. Трубецкого. 19 comments on how concrete idealism responds to the transcendental subjectivism of the West, but the notion of ‘altruism’ adds further to this response.
[684] Трубецкой С.Н. Основания идеализма, 713.
[685] Трубецкой С.Н. Основания идеализма, 710.

personal. This prepares the way for Trubetskoi's magisterial historical analysis of the Logos, as a guiding principle behind christology in his *Teaching of the Logos.* In this philosophical work, however, Trubetskoi only briefly links this "concrete determination of the Absolute" with Christian theology at the very end of *Foundations of Idealism.*

> This determination encloses in itself the logical basis for ethical philosophy and religious gnosis and corresponds to the demands of religious consciousness. It eliminates dualism, which sets the world against God and limits God by this abstract contradistinction; and it eliminates pantheism with its conflation of absolute and relative being. It corresponds to faith in a personal God, for it understands the absolute as a concrete subject, existing in-itself, for another and enclosing in itself the basis for its other. It corresponds to the ethical idea of God, as unlimited love, for it recognises altruism as a metaphysical determination of absolute being. It understands the universe in its universal determinism and at the same time in the freedom of its real otherness, in the freedom of its inner self-affirmation.[686]

For Trubetskoi, metaphysics, as concrete idealism, is characterised by divine altruism, clearly a synonym for divine kenosis. As becomes clear from the 'logological' account of *Teaching of the Logos,* this metaphysics is not only personalist, but has a christocentric core. This christocentric and personalist approach to metaphysics might be seen as idiosyncratic,[687] but it is surely a philosophical account that appealed to Men, as it was capable of giving a critical philosophical basis to the account of his "living encounter with Christ" (1.1.1). That faith plays such a significant epistemological role in Trubetskoi's system is also reminiscent of Men's remark that "in the first place I put faith, faith that is the only thing capable of saving us" in his criticism of Bulgakov's sophiology in his letter to Reitlinger (3.5.1). It also explains Trubetskoi's warm words for Luther in his letter to Harnack (3.3) and Men's respect for the Reformer.[688] Nonetheless, apart from these rather circumstantial parallels, there is little explicit engagement specifically with Trubetskoi's concrete idealist philosophy in Men's major works. He gives a brief and rather simplified account of it in his lecture on the Trubetskoi brothers, and devotes around two paragraphs to its hermeneutical implications in

[686] Трубецкой С.Н. Основания идеализма, 716-7.
[687] Trubetskoi departs from Heidegger by integrating his philosophy directly into a theological account of the relation between God and humans.
[688] *Dictionary* article 'Luther': Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том второй, 149-153.

his *Dictionary* article on Sergei Trubetskoi.[689] In the former he contrasts Trubetskoi's philosophy with the neo-Kantian foundations of Harnack's hermeneutical approach.

> Trubetskoi understood that the path to reality for humans is not closed. In this respect he had a serious disagreement with Harnack. He writes several works dedicated to the specificities of human consciousness, and the basis of idealism, as he understood it.[690] Not accepting the sceptical point of view of the neo-Kantians, he at the same time shows that the conception, which was developed from the eighteenth century and according to which the human being (the knowing subject) is, as it were, completely isolated, and the whole world stands in opposition to him/her, is a false point of view.... Trubetskoi in a whole series of works strove to show that the human being brings together his/her insights, theoretical and rational, only because he/she has contact with the thought of other subjects, that he/she is not isolated, that he/she is drawn into a kind of stream of the whole.[691]

The "stream of the whole" that Men refers to in Trubetskoi's thought might seem to find parallels in aspects of Heidegger's account of temporality, but in fact it looks back to earlier Russian thought. It is connected first of all with Solov′ev's conception of 'all-unity', but it is also, as Men correctly notes, connected with the Slavophile conception of ecclesiality (*sobornost′*).[692] Although by his later works, Trubetskoi had left the conception of the Church as Holy Sophia behind, the conception of ecclesiality remained a key factor in his gnoseology, as is especially clear from his *On the Nature of Human Consciousness*.[693] It stands in opposition to neo-Kantianism as it maintains that the knowing subject has contact with other subjects. This ideal of Christianity and the Church is not a formal and external requirement. As Men tells us, it means the "ecclesiality of thought, the ecclesiality of humanity and the ecclesiality of the people."[694] This understanding of ecclesiality had political consequences for both Trubetskoi and Men. Neither believed that a culture should try to stand on its own, in contradistinction to all others; it should be something that is allowed to develop according to an "organic living and constant interconnection, in exchange

---

689 He references Trubetskoi's accounts of Greek philosophy in *Dionysus, Logos, Fate:* Мень А.прот. Дионис, Логос, Судьба, 336з.112, 338з.154.
690 The most extended and significant of which is his *Foundations of Idealism.*
691 Мень А.прот. Русская религиозная философия, 76-77.
692 Мень А.прот. Русская религиозная философия, 78.
693 Трубецкой С.Н. О природе человеческого сознания.
694 Мень А.прот. Русская религиозная философия, 79.

and in dialogue with other cultures."[695] Trubetskoi therefore valued the freedom of expression, conscience and press, but ecclesiality also had implications for biblical interpretation (2.2.3). Different interpretations may be valued and allowed to run concurrently. This creates fertile ground for thought, since humans only think because they receive material for thought from other thinking beings. Thought is itself made possible by the existence of an objective logic and spirit that form what Vernadskii, and following him Teilhard de Chardin would later call the 'noosphere',[696] and it is directed in a linear fashion to what we have designated as divine-human culture.

The objective spirit that makes concrete consciousness and relationality possible has hermeneutical implications when we approach the Bible and Men briefly remarks on this in his *Dictionary.* We already noted (3.4.1) that the Bible cannot be approached as a 'petrified relic', due to the "living spiritual experience of concrete personality". It should not be merely recollected in an external manner, as the heart of the matter of interpretation is not recollection of the past, but Revelation itself. It is this Revelation that illuminates the tradition of the Church (understood as ecclesiality), serving as its source and partner in ongoing dialogue.[697]

3.6) Creation and Eschatology

The 'logological' interpretation of the scriptural 'wisdom' that connects Proverbs 8 with the accounts of Genesis 1-3 connects christology and anthropology with cosmology for both Men and Trubetskoi. While this is a theme that Trubetskoi does not develop at length in his own

[695] Мень А.прот. Русская религиозная философия, 78.
[696] Men connects Trubetskoi's ideas with the 'noosphere' in Русская религиозная философия, 79-80. Вернадский В.И. Биосфера и ноосфера. Айрис-пресс, 2012; Teilhard de Chardin, Pierre, *Phenomenon of Man,* (New York: Harper Perennial, 2008). Russian-language translation completed by Men's secretary Maslenikova: Тейяр де Шарден, Пьер. Феномен человека. М.: АСТ, 2002.
[697] Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том третий. 269.

writing, it formed the theological basis both for Men's evolutionism and his eschatology, two areas of his thought that have created considerable controversy among his more conservative critics, and two 'symbols' that formed the beginning and end of the scriptural metaphysical account of history.[698] The controversies over Men's 'symbolic' interpretations of Genesis 1-3 and Revelation are directly concerned with methods of biblical interpretation. To say these texts are 'symbols' does not mean that the events described are somehow 'unreal' or merely to be interpreted 'existentially'.[699] What he has in mind seems closer to Trubetskoi's description of the Cross as a "symbol of our redemption" in the first letter to Harnack, with all the Dionysian Eucharistic connotations. If the Eucharist is a 'symbol' then that is certainly not a 'mere sign', but a gateway from the explicable to the inexplicable divine mysteries made possible by the Incarnation. As he says in *Dictionary*,[700] "the anthropomorphic and naturomorphic forms of the Scriptures indicate the kenotic character of theophany and Revelation itself. Interpreting the Bible, the Holy Fathers emphasised that the conditional language of Scripture does not claim to be an absolutely precise depiction of divine reality."

Thus, the imagery of the six days, the *tohu vabohu* of the earth in Genesis 1:3, the creation of Adam, the snake and the Fall comprise a complex of 'symbols' that through Eucharistic experience and prayerful biblical study (that includes a role for critical study) are able to help

---

[698] Bulgakov's interpretation of Genesis and Revelation is analogous to that of Men. Sergius Bulgakov, *The Bride of the Lamb,* 69: "The entire Bible, beginning with the Six Days of Creation and ending with the Apocalypse, is the story of the revelation of God in time, in which He lives together with man, as it were".

[699] Магизм и единобожие 530-538 discusses four ways of interpreting the scriptural texts relating to the Fall: the 'abstract allegorical' method, 'naturalism and literalism', the 'Alexandrian method' (which he believes Berdyaev and Bulgakov followed, and he criticises their belief in a pretemporal Adam) and the static method (Teilhard de Chardin). Each, when taken separately, have their problems, but they each have positive emphases to contribute. "The first interpretation frees us from slavery to the word, the second asserts the character of the Fall as an event, the third connects the imperfection of the world with sin and freedom, the fourth sees the Fall in the context of world evolution" (537). Men believes the most fundamental issue is a conflation of two different problems: human sin and natural evil, due to an inability to take full account of the multiplicity of interacting 'symbols' in the Genesis accounts. To fully understand these symbols, scientific study of their meaning is required. In emphasising scientific study, Men differs from Bonhoeffer (Bonhoeffer, Dietrich, *Works, Volume 3, Creation and Fall: A Theological Exposition of Genesis 1-3* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004)), whose interpretation of the Fall is more easily interpreted as 'existential'.

[700] Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том второй. 322.

us enter into and understand the mysteries of creation[701] and the mysterious events and figures of Revelation, the thousand years of Revelation 20 and the vision of the new heaven and new earth help us enter into the divine purposes of history as the 'Kingdom of God'. That the text is seen as 'symbolic' has nothing to do with speaking in a language that contemporaries could understand; the language is symbolic precisely because it is expressing mysteries that can only be expressed symbolically and understood through intuition. In other words, it has an iconographic quality.

3.6.1) The Creation Narrative, the Identity of Adam and the Nature of the Fall

The narrative of Genesis 1-3 is discussed from different perspectives in four out of five of Men's most significant works. *Isagogics*[702] and *Dictionary* (article on *The Pentateuch*[703]) contain fairly detailed discussions of the differences of authorship and date between the two accounts of creation, and Men analyses the contextual implications of some of the Hebrew terms used. The discussions of *Wellsprings* and Appendix 8 (*The Bible and the Teaching of the Fall*) of *Magic Art and Monotheism* have been taken as a starting point, since these works give an account of the relationship between Christian doctrine and interpretation of the text. Men's substantial discussions of the science of evolutionary theory have also been set aside, as these are in part dated, but also inessential to establishing the outlines of his interpretive approach.

Much of Men's account is concerned with delineating the theology of the biblical account against the polytheistic and pantheistic teachings of the Ancient Near East. In *Wellsprings,*

[701] Bulgakov, *The Lamb of God,* 123: "...the very *act,* as well as the *fact,* of God's creation of the world is unfathomable for us, it is the boundary separating us from the Absolute.... Creation is therefore known not by thought but by faith."
[702] Мень А.прот. Исагогика, 104-5, 107-10.
[703] Пятикнижие in Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том второй. 528-556.

Men sets the biblical teaching in this context.

> It was only the biblical teaching that set against all shades of paganism and pantheism the idea of the creative act as an act of God's freedom, God's mind and God's love. This act is the link that binds the Absolute with all that is created. According to Scripture, the creative power of the God's Word, which summoned creation out of non-being, perpetually sustains and supports its existence.[704]

For Men, creation is a purposeful act with a linear trajectory and the two creation accounts of Genesis 1-3, despite differences in form, are in this respect united in theological perspective.[705] The power behind creation also supports and preserves creation. Thus, the doctrines of creation and preservation are related in continuum, rather than to be treated as discrete entities.[706] He continues with a characterisation of the process.

> The Bible portrays cosmogenesis as an ascent by steps from lower to higher, from the inorganic to the human: this process was completed with the help of mediation. In the Book of Genesis God is not presented as a "demiurge", a craftsman, creating goods with His hands. He imparts creative power to natural elements, the "land" and "water", and they as it were spontaneously produce plant and animal life.[707]

This account of creation and preservation as continuing cosmogenesis is entirely consistent with the evolutionism of Teilhard de Chardin,[708] although the latter's evolutionary mysticism departs from clear dependence on scriptural language. Using terminology closer to that of Trubetskoi, Men summarises this by telling us that the progressive ordering of the world through evolution is the victory of the Logos over chaos.[709] This includes the creative ordering of the world by the Logos, a process which is finally dependent on the humanisation

---

[704] Men, Alexander, *Wellsprings,* 127. Men summarises the beliefs of ancient pagan cosmogony in Исагогика, 105.

[705] Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том второй. 539.

[706] This invites comparison with Schleiermacher's doctrine of creation: *The Christian Faith,* 149-156.

[707] My translation of Истоки религии 123-124. Men cites Genesis 1:11,20,24 as evidence for mediation in creation, and Genesis 3:17, Psalm 96, 98 and Daniel 3:74 as evidence that the earth is a living being.

[708] Teilhard de Chardin, *The Phenomenon of Man. Wellsprings* Appendix 10 is a substantial essay on the thought of Teilhard: *Wellsprings,* 305-327, Истоки религии 315-340. Bulgakov has similar views on the mediating qualities of the elements, but Men's use of theological terminology is more cautious. He does not, for example, speak of the Six Days implying creation 'out of proto-matter' or creation of the earth 'by her own self-creativity' (*The Bride of the Lamb,* 66).

[709] Discussed in Магизм и единобожие 556-562.

of the world, represented in divine-human culture.[710] The mechanisms by which this takes place are secondary to the theological mysteries contained within the biblical narrative. The victory of the Logos over chaos finds further symbolic representation at the end of the Bible in the Book of Revelation.

With the linear progression of cosmic development, the human being made 'in the image and likeness of God' plays the critical role. Matter only on the human level becomes the genuine "image and likeness" of its Creator. The universal divine Mind, the Logos, manifests itself in the evolution of the world, most of all reflected in the personal mind and conscious will of the human being. There the highest Freedom and Creativity of the Creator is reflected in His creations.[711] God's creation of man, both in continuity with the animal kingdom and made in the image of God, is from both His breath and the dust of the earth.[712] The image is transferred in the 'breath' of God and it is this that gives humans their rationality and freedom.[713] The deposit of this divine likeness is the immortality of the human person.[714] In these basic characteristics, Men's anthropology is essentially consistent with that of the Cappadocian Fathers,[715] but he also uses it as a basis to draw on Solov′ev's conception of all-unity. He cites the philosopher.[716]

> As really one of the many beings in nature, the human being in his/her consciousness has the ability to grasp reason or the inner connection and meaning (Logos) of all that exists, is in idea like all that exists, and in this sense is a second all-unity, the image and likeness of God. In the human being nature outgrows itself and moves over (in consciousness) into the region of absolute being.

In this way we may begin to speak of 'ecclesiality', the expression of 'all-unity', as a

[710] Мень А.прот. Истоки религии 128.
[711] The nature of human freedom is discussed both from philosophical and scriptural perspectives in 'The Human and Freedom', Магизм и единобожие 525-529.
[712] Мень А.прот. Исагогика, 121-122.
[713] Brussels Bible commentary on Genesis 2:7: "to be alive is to be free".
[714] Chapter Seven of *Wellsprings* discusses immortality.
[715] Pelikan, Jaroslav: *Christianity and Culture: The Metamorphosis of Natural Theology in the Christian Encounter with Hellenism.* (New York: Vail-Ballou Press, 1993),127.
[716] Мень А.прот. Истоки религии 160. Соловьев В.С. Чтения о Богочеловечестве, 149.

community of subjects made in the image and likeness of God, or the noosphere of Vernadskii and Teilhard, something which has deep implications for human culture (Chapter Four). Here biblical theology gives a basis for biblical interpretation; the Logos and ecclesiality play a role in interpreting the 'symbols' of the biblical account of creation. We now consider two of those 'symbols' in greater detail.

3.6.1.1) The Fall

Despite his interest in the optimistic anthropology and cosmology of Teilhard and willingness to accept, following such 'Russian school' figures as Berdyaev, that the language of Genesis 3[717] is symbolic and mythological,[718] Men understands the Fall as a real event[719] with human sin as the real consequences,[720] even criticising Teilhard's understanding of evil as the weakest aspect of his theories.[721] While humans are called to rule over the world (Genesis 2:15),[722] thus mediating the continuing divine creative process, human sin works against this calling. This obvious dualism in human nature is described by the Bible, according to Men, as "the result of the fallenness and corruption of the whole spiritual organism of humanity."[723] It has weakened the forces set in the noosphere from the beginning and distanced people from God, making humans enemies of one another and of the natural world in which they live. Distinctions between Christian denominations and the secular and sacred are expressions of this, to be overcome by the 'second all-unity' expressed in divine-human culture.

[717] A commentary on the Fall narrative of Genesis 3 can be found in Мень А.прот. Исагогика 129-133.
[718] 'On the Origins of Evil and Sin', Бердяев Н. А. Философия свободы. Часть II, Глава V.1.: http://www.vehi.net/berdyaev/filos_svob/05.html [Accessed 17/12/2018].
[719] Мень А.прот. Истоки религии, 205. Analogous discussion in Bulgakov, *Unfading Light,* 318-326, and Булгаков, С.Н. Философия хояйства. 157.
[720] Men discusses fallen human nature in "About the reality of 'fallen humanity'", Магизм и единобожие. 521-524.
[721] Мень А.прот. Истоки религии, 339.
[722] Analogous discussion in Булгаков С.Н. Философия хозяйства. 164-165.
[723] Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие, 551.

This is reflected in the biblical teaching; the harmonious course of human development was disrupted and this explains human nature as we see it and much that has happened in human history.[724] Although physical death is a reality of the corrupted natural world that preceded Adam, the death died by Adam as a result of disobedience in tasting the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil,[725] was in fact a 'spiritual death', since physical death would be a mere 'external punishment'.[726] This is more fundamental than physical death and parallels the 'second death' of Revelation 20:14.[727] Spiritual death is the final result of unredeemed human history and civilisation, the result of humanity's desire to take charge of the world on its own terms,[728] yet it was not God's original plan, and neither is it the final word in Christian eschatology. If the Fall had not happened, then a spiritual kind of civilisation would have developed, denoted in the Bible by the term 'Eden'.[729] Eden, the Sabbath rest, and God's affirmation of the goodness of His creation, are images that not only relate to the beginning of the created world, but also have eschatological significance and look forward to the millennial kingdom of Revelation 20 and the final restoration of all things in Revelation 22.[730]

Thus two paths stand before humanity in its present temporal reality: spiritual, divine-human civilisation or fallen human history and civilisation that leads to spiritual death. According to Men, the possibility of this fundamental duality is connected with human freedom, one of the anthropological constituents of what it means to be made in the image and likeness of God.

---

724 Мень А.прот. Истоки религии, 191.

725 Brussels Bible commentary on Gen 2: 16-18: God's warning not to taste the fruit from this tree is the first example of a Covenant in the Bible, and emphasises Adam's ability to choose based on the rationality given to him by God.

726 Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие, 551. According to Men, this point shows the theological inadequacy of literalist interpretations.

727 Discussed by Men in Читая Апокалипсис, 209.

728 Discussed in Илюшенко В.И. Отец Александр Мень. 199-200.

729 Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие, 544-6, Исагогика 122-124. Bulgakov describes Eden as "a sort of eschatology of natural being", presented anew in Revelation 22:1-5. (*The Bride of the Lamb,* 179). Also Bulgakov, Sergius, *The Comforter,* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 193.

730 Мень А.прот. Исагогика, 114-115.

He draws on Berdyaev's discussion of metaphysical freedom to explain the nature of these two possibilities. Despite its clear reality, there is no causative reason for the existence of evil. For Berdyaev, as for Men, it is wholly irrational.[731] The Fall of the human race is therefore not rooted straightforwardly in itself. Indeed it is connected with a still deeper tragedy involving the forces of chaos in the Universe.

> Biblical teaching is often interpreted precisely in this sense. The first cause of cosmic imperfection is seen to be humanity, and for some strange reason this idea has become almost axiomatic for theology. Yet the Bible unequivocally bears witness to the fact that there never was a pre-human world without death or the eating of animals by each other. There is not the slightest suggestion in Scripture, for instance, that beasts of prey appeared only after the Fall.[732]

Evil finds its ultimate origins not solely in the corrupted human will, but in spiritual powers. Men builds this claim on the scriptural imagery of the snake in the Genesis narratives, which he claims was used as the symbol of certain pagan deities in the ancient world.[733] He cites Trubetskoi to tell us that snakes personified the abyss in ancient cosmogonies, as well as being a god of fertility and at the same time destruction and chaos.[734] This includes natural, physical death as well as all the other entropic processes of the natural world.[735] The snake was used to symbolise this force because "Christian theology came about in the struggle with heresies. Jewish religious thought developed in a stubborn and hard struggle with paganism, both of foreign and domestic origin."[736] The imagery finds a number of analogues in the Old Testament, but is particularly concentrated in the apocalyptic literature – Daniel and Revelation – where the snake, the dragon and Satan are synonyms. Here we may speak of

---

[731] Мень А.прот. Истоки религии 208,210-11. Бердяев Н.А. Философия свободного духа, ч. 1, Париж: YMCA, 1927, 235 and Новое религиозное сознание и общественность СПб: М.В. Пирожков, 1907, XXVI.

[732] Men cites Basil of Caesarea's *Hexaemeron IX* (http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/32019.htm [Accessed 17/12/2018]) which refers to different predators and the presence of organs of defence and attack at the Creation. Men, Alexander, *Wellsprings,* 204.

[733] Men discusses the dragon in Canaanite mythology in Исагогика 119.

[734] Мень А.прот. Истоки религии, 209-210. Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе, 276. Магизм и единобожие 562-567 discusses the ancient notion of the "pre-eternal abyss" and its influence on dualistic cosmogonies.

[735] Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие, 553-556.

[736] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе, 278. Men cites this in Исагогика 106.

suprahistorical and superhuman demonic agents working in the Universe as a whole and obstructing the realisation of God's purposes. These images are used in Scripture to link personal spiritual evil with the chaos we observe in the natural world,[737] thus forming the background and basis for the symbol of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. This symbol references not only the existential human rejection of divine providence and leading, but the 'magical' cults of the ancient world, such as the worship of Baal.[738] As far as Men is concerned, these practices represented the false anthropocentrism that seeks, by means of cultic 'technology' to take graceless control of the natural world, and it should be noted that with this description of ancient magic arts Men appears keen to emphasise parallels with the technological instrumentalism and materialism of Marxist political economy. As with Trubetskoi's *Metaphysics in Ancient Greece,* the ancient world is used to mirror the problems of the present.

The conflict between the agents of demonic evil, working with corrupted human nature, and God's purposes is a conflict between forces of corruption and destruction and the 'linear' progression of the Kingdom of God (3.4).

> It was only the Bible's teaching about the eschatological Kingdom of God that opened up a dynamic of humanity – and the universe – rising up to perfection.[739] But Scripture does not depict history as a process in which only the increase of good has a place. Just as the creation of the world was a struggle between Logos and chaos, history from its very beginning was the arena of confrontation between good and evil in humanity. Both of them have a tendency to grow. And with each epoch the antagonism between them becomes all the more intense.[740]

The antagonism is clearest in the Book of Revelation, which with its imagery, presents its reader with symbols representing the ontology of history.[741]

---

[737] Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие, 567-576 gives an analysis of the biblical imagery for chaos.
[738] Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие, 546-548, Исагогика 124-125.
[739] Men refers to Dawson, Christopher, *Progress and Religion,* (New York and London: Sheed & Ward, 1929), 125-126.
[740] Men, Alexander, *Wellsprings,* 190.
[741] Analogous discussion in Bulgakov, *Unfading Light,* 326-342: first this struggle of religious history is

3.6.1.2) The Term ‘Adam’ and its Implications for Redemption

Men is keen neither to see redemption in juridical terms nor original sin as a hereditary transfer of guilt.[742] Such a ‘Western’ account would sit awkwardly with his attempts to see the human Fall in the context of a more fundamental ‘cosmic’ fall. Yet, like Trubetskoi, Men does not wish to deny that original sin has objective reality. Just as the Bible uses such ‘symbols’ as the snake to personify this cosmic evil, the symbolism of the scriptural accounts becomes the key to understanding the inner meaning of original sin. Of specific relevance to the matter is the biblical symbol of ‘Adam’. Although Men does not completely deny the possibility that Adam did exist as a single individual in history,[743] he believes that this is not the most important sense in which the name is used in Scripture. Men refers to Bulgakov to maintain that the human being is not just a product of evolution, but has incorporated a spirit.[744] Therefore, he says, ‘Adam’ must mean something more than just a biological individual. He turns to the scriptural text to explain further.

In Genesis 1:26 the word “Adam” clearly has a manifold collective meaning, which predominates in other parts of the Bible. Adam is thought of not so much as a separate personality, but more as a personification of the whole of humanity. The merging of a group into one figure like this is generally

characterised in Johannine terms as a struggle between light and darkness, then the relationship between the Old Testament and the ‘paganism’ of its context is discussed. Bulgakov, however, has a more positive view of the role of paganism in world religious history than either Trubetskoi or Men, criticising those who describe it as ‘demonic’. “In Judaism and paganism two antinomically linked sides of religious consciousness, both of its poles, were opposed with the greatest force: the transcendence and immanence of God to the world, and only Christianity (in the word of the Apostle Paul) was able to ‘reconcile’ the split religious self-consciousness through the divine incarnation”. 341.

742 In *Magic Art and Monotheism* (Магизм и единобожие), Appendix 8, Men presents a critical history of the doctrine of original sin (515-519). Although the Yahwist notes a gradual increase in human evil, only in Paul are we presented with a fully coherent doctrine. In Romans 7:15 the Christian has two centres struggling against each other. If in Genesis, sin is an external act, in Paul’s letters it is mystical and part of a dramatic dialogue between God and humans.

743 Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие, 538: “A macromutation that straightaway separated Homo Sapiens from its natural family tree is theoretically possible”. His children’s story, *A Tale of Human Origins*, is an investigation of this possibility: Мень А.прот. Сказка о происхождении человека. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2016.

744 Bulgakov, Sergius, *The Bride of the Lamb,* 175-187: 175: “Evolution is interrupted, and zoology and physiology are surpassed; man is created”.

characteristic of the biblical way of thinking. Scripture many times speaks about Jacob, Mizraim [Egypt] and Ashur as if about individuals when in fact whole peoples are meant.[745]

In addition to this eponymous understanding of Adam, Men finds a basis for a philosophical interpretation of 'Adam' first of all in Judaism, then in Christian tradition. In *Wellsprings,* he remarks that Philo referred to Adam as a spiritual being that included within itself the whole of humanity. In *Magic Art and Monotheism,* Men adds a reference to Trubetskoi's account of Philo's anthropology. "When the influences of Greek philosophy penetrated Judaism, various attempts to understand this Old Testament vision of a single human being in conceptual form appeared. Philo interpreted Adam in the spirit of Platonism, calling him the 'idea' of humanity."[746] Concrete humans were, according to Philo, incarnations of this 'heavenly Adam', a term also used by the Apostle Paul to describe Christ.[747] Thus, Men tells us, Paul built on these conceptions of Philo when establishing the christology of his letters, especially in seeing the Church as the mystical Body of Christ (Romans 12:5). By contrast the 'first Adam' was for Paul a mystical concentration of natural humanity (1 Corinthians 15:45). Although the harmony of the first Adam was lost at the Fall, it was redeemed in the second, heavenly Adam.[748] This redemption is the result of the kenosis (Men uses the Russian *umalenie*) of the Incarnation,[749] which revealed in the world the full creative power of the Logos in a new act.[750] That Paul incorporated the Church in the redemptive act of Christ as the Body of Christ in this way finds parallels in the Patristic understanding of the identity of Adam. In *Wellsprings,* Men summarises this Christian Patristic tradition on the matter.[751]

---

[745] Men, Alexander, *Wellsprings,* 208.
[746] Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие, 539-40 refers to Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе, 180.
[747] 1 Cor. 15:47 is referred to in Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие, 540. Also discussed by Bulgakov in *Unfading Light,* 292.
[748] Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие, 550.
[749] Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие, 577.
[750] Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие, 579.
[751] In Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие, 541-2, the Fathers listed in support of a collective Adam include Tertullian, Origen, Gregory of Nazianzus, Ambrose of Milan, Augustine, John Chrysostom, Isaac the Syrian, and Symeon the New Theologian, as well as Gregory of Nyssa. Also Исагогика, 113-114.

In Christianity this tradition was extended and developed. The Apostle Paul taught about two Adams, the Old and the New. The second is none other than the Church, of which Christ is the head. In the second century Clement of Alexandria wrote that before diversity among the peoples there was spiritual unity in Adam.[752] According to St. Gregory of Nyssa, "Created man had no particular name, he is *everyman*; that is, he includes all humanity in himself". This "Adam" was created only once, and it was in him that the image of God was imprinted. St Gregory said the image was "human nature, understood in its totality." This nature continues to exist even now, incarnate in separate individuals, all the while maintaining its unity.[753]

This interpretation of Gregory of Nyssa, used to establish the symbolic nature of the scriptural term "Adam" was subjected to strong criticism by Volgin, who claimed Men misunderstood the passage.[754] Men thinks the 'universal' term is Adam, when in fact it is 'man', he says. Things are perhaps not quite so clear either way, however. Gregory's exegetical starting point for the passage in question might be the "observation that the verse mentions the creation of 'man', not 'Adam'",[755] but, despite this, 'Adam' does not seem to be regarded as a single individual.[756] Men, following this 'symbolic' and 'collective' understanding of Adam, cites Harnack that in the writings of the Fathers, "Adam was for the majority the type, not the progenitor of sinners".[757] Given Men's substantial engagement with Harnack (3.2) it may be debated whether on this point the greatest authority for Men is Harnack's account of the Fathers or the Fathers themselves. In any case, it is clear that Men's starting point for his interpretation of the scriptural "Adam" is not Patristic, but 'Russian school' exegesis, and Gregory of Nyssa is used to support, perhaps anachronistically, the use of the Solov′evian term 'everyman' or 'all-human' (*vsechelovek*). He then goes on to cite both Solov′ev and Bulgakov.[758] Adam is "an *all-unified personality* comprising in itself the whole

[752] Clement of Alexandria: *Stromata 1:18,* http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/02101.htm [Accessed 17/12/2018].

[753] Men, Alexander, *Wellsprings,* 208-9. Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Making of Man* 16, http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/2914.htm [Accessed 17/12/18].

[754] Антиминсов С.прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как комментатор священного писания, 6-7 (2.1.1.1).

[755] Genesis 1:27.

[756] Zachhuber, Johannes, *Human Nature in Gregory of Nyssa: Philosophical Background and Theological Significance* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 156.

[757] Harnack, Adolf von, *Outlines of the History of Dogma,* 232. Гарнак, Адолф фон. История догматов, 323.

[758] Men, Alexander, *Wellsprings,* 209-210, Соловьев В.С. Чтения о Богочеловечестве, 162. Булгаков С.прот. Купина неопалимая: Опыт догматического истолкования некоторых черт в православном почитании Богоматери. Париж: YMCA-Press, 1927. Bulgakov, Sergius, *The Burning Bush: On the Orthodox Veneration of the Mother of God,* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009). Bulgakov further reflects on the nature of Adam in *The Bride of the Lamb,* 113: "The integral Adam, humanity in its totality, is supratemporal, but

of human nature" and "does not have an individual personality in the sense in which we now understand it": individuals in the collective organism are "simply spray from the one wave, hypostatic manifestations of the one humanity." This is based in the 'plurality-in-unity' denoted by Solov′ev's philosophical term 'all-unity'. Despite the event of the Fall and the reality of human sin, the unity of Adam remains intact and this, for Men, is the deposit of our redemption in the future forward-movement of Adam's race through regeneration as 'the Body of Christ' on towards final eschatological revelation. This movement is towards the 'all-human unity' of divine-human culture, called the noosphere by Teilhard and Vernadskii.[759]

3.6.2 Revelation (the Apocalypse)

From this we can see that while the narrative of the Fall demonstrates the beginnings of cosmic conflict in both human and cosmic freedom, the image of Adam presents us with the original form of human ecclesiality. The biblical teaching of Adam, claims Evgenii Trubetskoi, contains two fundamental intuitions: "the intuition of the communality of human nature and the intuition of freedom as the beginning of sin."[760] From an anthropological perspective, it is only on the basis of these two intuitions that redemption through Christ, the heavenly Adam, may be fully understood. Yet this redemption can also be characterised as the final victory of the Logos over chaos that leads to the eschatological realisation of God's plan for his world, and here the images and 'symbolism' of the Book of Revelation, which have much in common with those of Genesis,[761] come into play.

---

he is also created by God for time, as Man, or the All-man" (*vsechelovek* – Russian language version: Булгаков С. прот. Невеста Агнца. Париж: YMCA-Press, 1945). *The Bride of the Lamb,* 175-177 also discusses the nature of 'Adam'.

759 Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие, 543.

760 Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие, 543. Men cites Трубецкой Е.Н. Смысл жизни – Сост. А.П. Полякова, П.П. Апрышко. М.: Республика, 1994. 153.

761 Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие, 583.

The prominence of the Book of Revelation in Men's works as a whole may be debated. His 'commentary' on Revelation *Reading the Apocalypse*, while inviting comparison with Bulgakov,[762] was not conceived as a commentary; it consists of recorded *besedy* with Men's parishioners, and therefore on a methodological level, its centrality for establishing Men's interpretive views is questionable. In Men's major 'works' there is far less discussion of Revelation, than there is for example of Genesis 1-3, the Prophets, the Gospels or Paul. Brief discussions in *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life* combine with a fairly substantial discussion in *Dictionary* and the commentaries in the *Brussels Bible,* assuming the latter are his, to give us the central picture of Men's thinking on this final book of the Bible. There are significant differences between these works and Men's 'commentary'. There is less obvious dependence on Bulgakov, and a more measured approach to chiliasm. There are also parallels. In both his major works and the *besedy*, Men emphasises the 'symbolic' nature of the numerology,[763] and the various figures in the book, especially drawing on parallels between it and Old Testament imagery. In doing this, his interest in isagogical details goes considerably beyond that of Bulgakov. A good example of this may be found in his commentary on Revelation 7:1-3.

> The four angels are a form taken from the Book of the prophet Zechariah, where it speaks of four angels standing at the throne (Zechariah 6:5); they, according to the number of countries in the world, signify the fullness of the spiritual world. Before the days of sorrow begin, all the chosen, in other words holy remnant, are marked with a seal. Remnant is a term taken from the Old Testament, signifying the little flock among the people of God. In the Book of the prophet Ezekiel, it speaks of the same thing: disaster is coming, but the Angel places the seal "tav" [Hebrew letter] on the foreheads of people (Ezekiel 9:4-6). Pay attention to the surprising, mystical coincidence. In modern Hebrew square script "tav" reminds [the reader] of the Russian "п", but in ancient alphabets – in Canaanite and Phoenician – the letter "tav" looked like a cross, either the cross of St. Andrew, or simply a cross as in all Phoenician inscriptions.... Among ancient Christians the letter "tav" probably became the first sign of covering oneself with the sign of the cross and covering the believer with holy water at the time of baptism; in other words it was a sign of Christ, and not many noticed its connection with the surprising prototype of the prophet Ezekiel. Here it is the same symbol. Among

[762] Louth, Andrew, *Modern Orthodox Thinkers,* 330.

[763] Men explains how the book is structured around the number '7'. Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том второй. 324.

the storms and commotions of the world a little flock is chosen, in which every member has the seal of baptism, and not only the seal of baptism, but the seal of following the Lamb.[764]

Men's commentary on this passage emphasises four characteristics of his interpretive approach to the book as a whole. While Bulgakov, in his considerably longer commentary on this passage, emphasises the metaphysical nature of these angels, and speaks in Dionysian terms of angelic hierarchies,[765] Men espouses 'metaphysical modesty' by eschewing any discussion of angelic hierarchies in favour of a solitary reference to Zechariah 6:5, by which he explains the significance of the angels in a first-century Semitic context. Bulgakov, when speaking of the seal on the foreheads of the 144,000 refers to the same passage of Ezekiel as Men, but he does so in order to emphasise not the connection between the two passages, but the distinction. He does not refer to the "tav" at all, and does not discuss the intricacies of ancient semitic languages. From this, we see the first two characteristics: first Men is keen to use the results of scientific linguistic, archaeological and historical study to inform his interpretation; second, he is keen to emphasise the close thematic connections between Old and New Testaments. Thus in his interpretive methodology he reminds the reader far more of Trubetskoi responding to Harnack than Bulgakov in his sophiological reflections. Third, Men and Bulgakov have in common that they emphasise the ecclesial aspect of this text, explaining how the Old Testament 'remnant' finds fulfilment in the vision of the sealed 144,000. In this, of course, Men is continuing a theme from his discussion of the nature of 'Adam' in Genesis 1-3 (3.6.1), linking scriptural anthropology with ecclesiality (*sobornost'*). Fourth, Men's discussion of the *tav* lends his interpretation of this same ecclesiality a more concentrated christocentricity than that of Bulgakov. The reality of the Church is linked to baptism and to the Christian path of the individual believer, whereas Bulgakov's interpretation of this passage principally considers the nature of the Church only in its

[764] Мень А.прот. Читая апокалипсис. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011, 78-79.
[765] Булгаков С.прот. Апокалипсис Иоанна: Опыт догматического истолкования. Париж: YMCA-Press, 1948, 63-64: http://www.odinblago.ru/bulgakov_apokalipsis/7 [Accessed 17/12/2018].

heavenly and metaphysical aspects.

Despite Men's interest in historical criticism, he would surely have agreed with Bukharev's comment that "revelation and history are nothing but expositions of one and the same subject matter in different languages: revelation prefigures history, and the latter verifies the former."[766] In this way, Men, like Trubetskoi, is consistent with the 'Russian school' tradition in which he stands, in the sense that he sees revelation as constitutive in a metaphysical account of history. We are reminded once more that the revelation of Scripture has an iconographic quality. As noted above in our discussion of Men's interpretation of Genesis 1-3, a major component of this historical account is its ever-increasing tension and conflict. As though building on his discussion of Revelation 7:1-3, Men writes the following in *Magic Art and Monotheism.*

> The history of Christianity cannot be a straightforward and peaceful current, for until now the depths of the Abyss are open, and the freedom to oppose the work of Christ is preserved. Therefore just as the path of the God-man led through the Cross, His Church also goes through the Cross.[767]

These difficulties are at their most extreme in the eschatological era represented by Revelation, and are reflected in much of its opposing symbolism. Thus the seal of the Cross on the foreheads of the 144,000 is counterposed with the 'mark of the Beast', 666, (Revelation 13:16-18), placed on the right hand and forehead of all those who follow the Beast. While this imagery has direct relevance to the context in which the book was written, with the Beast corresponding to the Roman Emperor and the false prophet to those who

---

[766] Бухарев А. М. Исследования Апокалипсис. Сергиевъ Посадъ: Богословского Вестника, 1916, 22, cited by Vallière, Paul, *Modern Russian Theology,* 81. Vallière sees Bukharev as the forerunner of the 'Russian school'. His substantial commentary on the Book of Revelation was controversial in nineteenth-century Russia, and is discussed by Men in Бухарев (1822-71), Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том первый. 173-175. Solov'ev's *Short Tale about the Antichrist,* the 'epilogue' to his *Three Conversations* (Три разговора), is the other key nineteenth-century work on Revelation: Соловьев В.С. Три разговора – Собрание сочинений. Том десятый, 193-221.

[767] Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие, 582.

create a counterfeit ecclesial community around the cult of the Emperor,[768] it also has a 'metahistorical' significance. It represents the building of the Church in time in the midst of ever-present enemy powers; the original ecclesial community, represented by the term 'Adam' in Genesis 1-3 is now in Revelation a far more fragmented and complicated affair, perhaps easier to relate to the divisions of ecclesial life in modernity.[769]

This metahistorical account of conflict between the community of faith and the community opposed to God's purposes in history is not specific to the New Testament era. Men refers to the demonic powers of world monarchies in the Book of Daniel, and explains that the Old Testament imagery referring to this conflict includes the concept of the Messiah who will come in victory, bringing the final eschatological vision of glory and harmony (Revelation 21:1). Thus Revelation gives a metahistorical account of a number of the themes that link the Old Testament and New Testament for Trubetskoi and Men, including the community of faith and Messianism (3.4.2-3). Development in time is juxtaposed with eschatological vision to bring hope to the faithful using symbolism and imagery primarily from Old Testament sources. Furthermore, Men believes, the message of Revelation has particular relevance to the troubled times in which he lived. As with Bulgakov,[770] the historical battle between good and evil in world history led Men to study Revelation. Men writes in *Wellsprings, "*the nihilists of the last century mocked the Apocalypse, calling it 'the work of a mad-man'. Could they have realised that the epoch they awaited so much would need to be described in the terms of this visionary book?"[771] For both Bulgakov and Men, when the opposition between the Church and the powers of Satan in Revelation 12 is set in the context of the

[768] Men also alludes to Mark 12:15-17 in his commentary on this passage: Мень А.прот. Читая апокалипсис 136-137.
[769] Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие, 582, Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том второй. 324-325. He supports using different approaches to interpreting Revelation simultaneously.
[770] Bulgakov wrote his commentary on the Apocalypse at the height of the Second World War.
[771] Мень А.прот. Истоки религии 198.

vision of Christ enthroned in Revelation 5,[772] which is the ultimate expression of divine-humanity from its heavenly perspective,[773] then the struggles of history find their ultimate meaning. For both theologians, the last three chapters of Revelation form the 'iconographic' content of our Christian future hope, which is the centre of the book's metahistory and final resolution of the conflict. Men's interpretation of these final three chapters has been controversial, however. Predein, for example, tells us the following in his book on Men.

> On the one hand the defence of chiliastic positions by Fr. Aleksandr can be considered the expression of a certain specific peculiarity: his ever-present futuristic optimism in relation to the immense perspectives of Christianity in world history.... But it is impossible not to notice that Fr. Aleksandr in a certain sense went further than both [Solov′ev and Bulgakov] in support of this doctrine. In comparison with the fairly indeterminate and dreamy chiliasm of Solov′ev and Bulgakov, that fluctuated between premillennialism and postmillennialism, the faith of Fr. Aleksandr in the correctness of chiliasm has a much more concrete, assertive, and even passionate form.... Responsibly attributing Fr. Aleksandr's chiliasm to either premillennialism or postmillennialism is not possible, insofar as the fact of the Last Judgment, which for example Fr. Sergius Bulgakov a priori accepted in the most traditional form, with Fr. Aleksandr finds a somewhat abstract interpretation.... It is paradoxical, but a fact, that certain eschatological texts of the Holy Scriptures that the Holy Fathers understood allegorically (the first resurrection, the thousand-year Kingdom of Christ), Fr. Aleksandr preferred to understand literally, and that in which the Holy Fathers saw a literal sense (The Last Judgment, the eternal fire of hell), Fr. Aleksandr allowed the possibility of an allegorical interpretation.[774]

Predein attributes these 'weaknesses' of Men's interpretations to an excessive interest in the evolutionism of Teilhard de Chardin.[775] Although it is of course true that Men had great sympathy with many of Teilhard's views, it should be noted that Men did not accept Teilhard's theological thought entirely uncritically, especially his account of the nature of evil (3.6.1).[776] Furthermore, from the outset it is clear that Predein's account of Men's eschatology is also entirely dependent on material taken from his *besedy* and lectures, rather than his major works. The most substantial collection of *besedy* on this theme, his commentary on Revelation, does indeed include reflection on the 'reality' of the millennial kingdom of

[772] Мень А.прот. Читая апокалипсис, 116-125, Булгаков С.прот. Апокалипсис Иоанна, 85-99.
[773] Мень А.прот. Читая апокалипсис, 63, Булгаков С.прот. Апокалипсис Иоанна, 50.
[774] Предеин Д.прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как выдающийся православный катехизатор. 156-159.
[775] Предеин Д.прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как выдающийся православный катехизатор. 159.
[776] Mullaney, Daniel, 'Creation and Evolution: The Problem of Evil in the Writings and Lectures of Alexander Men', *Koinonia: The Journal of the Anglican & Eastern Churches Association,* No. 67, 32-51, especially 36-41 on Men's engagement with Teilhard.

Revelation 20.[777] Contra Augustine's 'amillennial' account,[778] there has never been a period in ecclesiastical history when evil was completely 'paralysed', he tells us. Even if the contemporary Jewish messianic symbolism that lay behind this realisation of the Kingdom of God was materialistic and syncretic, we should not discount the reality behind this imagery. "Revelation is the revelation of God, so we should find behind its symbols and forms the Word of God addressed to us."[779]

In order to understand precisely in what sense Men wants to assert the 'reality' of the millennial kingdom it is necessary to consider briefly his critical account of these materialistic conceptions of Jewish apocalyptic literature. In this, Men cited extensively both Sergei Trubetskoi and Sergei Bulgakov. Trubetskoi's presentation of the nature of Jewish apocalyptic literature is given in *Teaching of the Logos.*[780] Discussing the messianic kingdom, which in various writings may last from anywhere between 400 and 1000 years,[781] he notes its materialistic character. The bliss and glory of the messianic kingdom is described in the brightest sensual colours which include the sale of the children of Israel's enemies into slavery, the seed of Jacob taking over the whole world, the killing of both the Leviathan and the Behemoth so that they can be eaten at a great and miraculous feast, lifespans stretching to 1000 years and painless childbirth.[782]

"These are the origins of chiliasm", he tells us. They are not only the origins of Christian chiliasm, but the origins of the materialistic conceptions of early Christian Gnosticism.[783] Bulgakov takes the implications of Trubetskoi's account of apocalyptic literature further, by

[777] Мень А.прот. Читая апокалипсис, 204-205.
[778] Мень А.прот. Читая апокалипсис, 199.
[779] Мень А.прот. Читая апокалипсис, 200.
[780] in Часть II, Глава III. Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета книга I, 244.
[781] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе, 320.
[782] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе, 322-323.
[783] Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о Логосе, 342. Also Часть II, Глава IV.

applying them to the problems of the present, in his early article *Apocalyptic Literature and Socialism*.[784] There he remarks that Marxist political economy merely supplants the old symbolism of these texts with conceptions of slavery, feudalism and capitalism.

Building on both Trubetskoi and Bulgakov, Men criticises the "coarse materialistic chiliasm" of 1 Enoch and tells us, following Bulgakov, that "in this unsophisticated picture we recognise that dream, which in modern secular mythology is called 'a bright future' and everlasting progress."[785] From this we can see that Men built on the historical critical work of Trubetskoi and social analysis of Bulgakov to arrive at a conclusion not far from that of Augustine in *City of God* XX, 7, at least with respect to the negative qualities of materialistic chiliasm.

> And this opinion would not be objectionable, if it were believed that the joys of the saints in that Sabbath shall be spiritual, and consequent on the presence of God; for I myself, too, once held this opinion. But, as they assert that those who then rise again shall enjoy the leisure of immoderate carnal banquets, furnished with an amount of meat and drink such as not only to shock the feeling of the temperate, but even to surpass the measure of credulity itself, such assertions can be believed only by the carnal.[786]

Even if both Bulgakov and Men want to see the millennial kingdom as a 'reality', we must conclude that this reality is not straightforwardly materialistic. In his early article, it is clear Bulgakov believed that the Book of Revelation represents a Christian reworking of the apocalyptic genre.[787] It does not symbolise or explicate historical events in the same materialistic way as those writings, but concerns itself with metahistory, the noumenal side of a universal process.[788] Referring specifically to Revelation 20:4-6, Bulgakov remarks on two tendencies in the Christian interpretation of chiliasm, the Jewish sensual historical tendency,

---

[784] Булгаков С.Н. Апокалиптика и соцализм. - Два Града. 604.
[785] Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета книга I, 340.
[786] Augustine of Hippo, *City of God:* http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/120120.htm [Accessed 17/12/2018].
[787] Булгаков С.Н. Апокалиптика и соцализм. 656.
[788] Булгаков С.Н. Апокалиптика и соцализм. 662.

and the spiritual tendency. In the first case chiliasm is the purpose of history and the ideal of progress, reached by historical development, and therefore relates entirely to the future. In the second, chiliasm relates to past, present and future and the Church is itself to be identified with the millennial Kingdom, since Satan has already been bound with the first coming of Christ. Bulgakov has not yet worked out his chiliastic conceptions in as much detail as in his final two works, *The Bride of the Lamb* and *The Apocalypse,* but is content merely to state that the Orthodox Church has remained neutral to these two approaches, which in turn represent striving towards revelation of new answers and Churchly givenness.[789] In the discussion in his *Dictionary* article on Revelation, Men essentially repeats Bulgakov's 'neutral' conclusion. "There is no commonly agreed exegesis [of Revelation 20:4-6] in the Church, therefore the prophecy of the millennial kingdom has on several occasions fed the idea of chiliasm."[790] It must be acknowledged that Men, at least in this text, stops far short of the personal, passionate advocacy of chiliasm claimed for him by Predein.

Men does briefly refer to Teilhard in his 'commentary' (*besedy*),[791] perhaps giving some weight to Predein's argument that Teilhard's cosmic vision stands behind Men's chiliastic views. Nonetheless, Bulgakov is cited in far greater detail, especially his connection of the passage with Ezekiel 37. The millennial kingdom is not simply a historical space for the physical revivification of individuals who have died, but it is the revival of the people of faith, the Church. Where Predein refers to Bulgakov's introductory work *Orthodoxy* as his primary source for Bulgakov's more 'straightforward' views,[792] it seems Men's inspiration for his interpretation of the millennial kingdom in his 'commentary' can be found not in that work, but in Bulgakov's *The Bride of the Lamb* and *The Apocalypse,* which are anything but straightforward. Men is completely consistent with the 'chiliastic' views of Bulgakov

[789] Булгаков С.Н. Апокалиптика и соцализм. 672-675.
[790] Мень А.прот. Библиологический Словарь. Том второй. 326.
[791] Мень А.прот. Читая апокалипсис, 200.
[792] Булгаков С.прот. Православие: Очерки учения Православной Церкви, 224.

expressed in *The Apocalypse.* Both believe that this 'first resurrection', not understood as a bodily resurrection of the saints or for that matter as a literal period of 1000 years, is nonetheless a very real, new epoch in the life of the Church on earth where the poisonous breath of satan is no longer present.[793] This is not the literal interpretation of some early Christian apologetes;[794] it is, however, a very 'real' epoch in the life of the Church and a 'reality' in very much the same sense that 'Eden' in Genesis 2-3 is for both Bulgakov and Men (3.6.1). In other words, it is a 'metahistorical' reality that represents the final realisation of divine-human spiritual culture and civilisation.

For both Men and Bulgakov, the millennial kingdom is only a prelude to the 'Second Resurrection' of Revelation 21, which is the apotheosis of sacred history.[795] Here the imagery becomes even more problematic. Its iconographic language is presented as a mosaic of Old Testament forms.[796] The New Jerusalem is an image of the Kingdom of God.[797] Men believes the passage is concerned with the transfiguration of existing creation rather than a 'new creation'. Again, in this Men is far closer to Bulgakov than Predein allows and paraphrases him at length.[798]

> Fr. Sergii Bulgakov suggests that the former creation is preserved, but is transfigured.[799] This thought is close to our Orthodox consciousness. But many contemporary biblical scholars hold that this is about a complete liquidation of the old creation and creation of a new. They follow the letter strictly and think that the letter gives them precisely this solution. For us it is important that the principle of existence itself, Wisdom, which was set within the creation of the world, is not created anew, but transfigured, and consequently we can say that what is fundamental in creation does not perish.[800]

The end-point of history, the City of God of Revelation 22, is therefore in continuity with

[793] Булгаков С.прот. Апокалипсис Иоанна, 178-192.
[794] Brussels Bible commentary on Revelation 20:4-6.
[795] Мень А.прот. Читая апокалипсис, 212, Булгаков С.прот. Апокалипсис Иоанна, 206.
[796] Мень А.прот. Читая апокалипсис, 213.
[797] Мень А.прот. Читая апокалипсис, 214, Булгаков С.прот. Апокалипсис Иоанна, 214.
[798] Predein's view that Bulgakov holds a traditional view of the Last Judgment is surely greatly stretched by the eschatological section of *The Bride of the Lamb* (379-526).
[799] Bulgakov, Sergius, *The Bride of the Lamb* 417-428.
[800] Мень А.прот. Читая апокалипсис, 215.

God's creation of the universe in the beginning, in which Wisdom, identified with the Logos, Jesus Christ, took part. God's statements that what he has made is 'good' are now realised in full, with all of their eschatological weight.

Thus some of the principal themes Men had in common with Trubetskoi are intertwined and brought together in a final eschatological realisation of biblical history. The use of the Dionysian 'symbol' and references to the iconographic image are combined with historical analyses of these same images and symbols as a basis for scriptural hermeneutics. Ecclesiality as Adam, the Remnant, the Church and the 144,000 of Revelation and conflict between the Logos-Wisdom and chaos provide biblical history with its interpretive metanarrative. Most importantly, the divine-humanity of Jesus Christ, the Logos, expressing divinity kenotically in the Incarnation and at the Cross lead us through faith, the fundamental epistemological criterion, to the end-point of history, shown symbolically in Revelation 22.

3.7) General Summary

Men's biblical theology draws a great deal from Sergei Trubetskoi. His emphases on messianism and prophetism have much in common with those of the latter, as do his interpretations of the role of ethics and eschatology in christology. Their belief in a linear revelatory conception of world history led both to see Eastern Orthodox spiritual practices in ambivalent terms, but the developmental character of culture positively. The revelatory role of the community of faith, the Church, was central for both Men and Trubetskoi in their biblical theology, and for them the apocryphal apocalyptic texts represented a retrogressive development of Old Testament prophetic insight later developed in 'gnostic' fatalism. Trubetskoi is by no means the only 'Russian school' figure that Men drew on to interpret

Scripture. Bulgakov, for example, played a significant role in Men's thinking on the Creation narrative, Revelation and apocalyptic literature. Kartashev's isagogics and Berdyaev's version of 'demythologisation' also featured prominently. Trubetskoi's centrality for Men may be attributed in no small measure to the fact that he added greater 'scientific' clarity to the biblical thought of Solov′ev, while preempting much that would be said later by Bulgakov, Kartashev and Berdyaev.

Nonetheless, Trubetskoi's engagement with German theologian Adolf von Harnack is also significant. Chapter Three has taken this as its starting point in order to trace the development of a certain kind of biblical theology from its origins in Trubetskoi's critique of Harnack through to Men's use of biblical 'symbols' in his interpretations of the Creation accounts and the Book of Revelation. These show how the creation of a divine-human culture may be developed from biblical interpretation, and this divine-human culture, among other things, acts as a tacit critique of Marxist political economy. Both Trubetskoi and Men greatly respected Harnack as a writer and valued his attempts to combine faith with historical criticism of the biblical texts, although both shared a suspicion of Harnack's neo-Kantian presumptions. Both sought to replace these with a Christ-centred, logological, divine-human 'metaphysical' approach that drew on the Schleiermacherian language of 'God-consciousness' to describe the divine-humanity of Christ. This has particular relevance to how the relationship between biblical theology and biblical interpretation is understood in their work. If Harnack's 'historical' biblical theology is dependent on the importation of a 'neo-Kantian' philosophical hermeneutic, then for Trubetskoi and Men, things move in the opposite direction. Their divine-human biblical theology that combines the notion of God-consciousness with a Chalcedonian account of the Person of Christ, provides the foundations of their interpretive approach. This can be seen by the way in which Men synthesises

'historical' questions with the notion of 'symbol' in his interpretations of Genesis 1-3 and the Book of Revelation. Among these symbols, the term 'Adam' is interpreted ecclesially, and the New Testament Church is understood, following Paul, as 'the Body of Christ', the second Adam. Revelation expresses the eschatological realisation of the Church as spiritual civilisation and divine-human culture in such images as Eden, the millennial kingdom and the 144,000. These are ecclesial expressions of the divine-humanity and provide a biblical basis for how the divine-human and ecclesial principles of biblical interpretation are to be applied (2.2). The universalising nature of what is expressed by these ecclesial symbols also, through its transforming power, is able to heal the divisions brought into human society and culture by the Fall. All of this may equally be seen as a 'biblical' reworking of Solov′ev's conception of 'all-unity', which is given a philosophical analysis in such works as *Lectures on Divine-Humanity.*

Despite the influence of Solov′ev's 'all-unity' on both, neither Trubetskoi nor Men saw the related sophiology, later developed by Bulgakov, as a productive response to the 'tragedy of philosophy', regarding it as too kataphatic. Instead, Trubetskoi formulated a philosophy of 'concrete idealism', which analysed the epistemological potential of 'faith' alongside related notions of altruism or kenosis. Although the same philosophical acumen cannot be found in Men's work, the centrality of 'faith' resonates clearly in his writings. He did not write much on Trubetskoi's philosophy, preferring to discuss his biblical theology and interpretation, but Men nonetheless clearly understood Trubetskoi's philosophical conceptions and related to them positively. The revelatory role of divine kenosis, the hermeneutical weight of the Dionysian 'symbol' and the importance of 'images' rather than dogma in expressing the truths of Scripture were significant to him. The fact that Men attributed to the ecclesial character of Trubetskoi's philosophy the seeds of Vernadskii's 'noosphere'[801] also sheds light

[801] Vernadskii was a close associate of Trubetskoi from the end of 1880: Вернадский В.И. Черты

on Men's rather notorious engagement with Teilhard de Chardin.[802] The universalising and developmental character of this 'humanisation' of the world is related back to Cappadocian theological anthropology concerning the 'Image of God' and provides Men with a way of expressing positively the potential of human spiritual culture for transforming the world. Of course, this potential can only be fully realised through faith in Christ, whereby culture is not merely conditional and relative, but divine-human.

Where it has frequently been remarked that Trubetskoi's philosophical worldview was left substantially incomplete at his premature death in 1905,[803] something similar might be said about Men, with his death in 1990. That is not to say that if they had lived longer they would have provided us with more coherent philosophical formulations or clearer methodologies for biblical interpretation. Both Trubetskoi and Men, after all, did not see themselves primarily as theoreticians. They were in different ways interested in actually changing the societies in which they found themselves, along the lines of their philosophical and theological principles. Men wished to provide his readers and listeners with resources for their own faith-led searches and became for his parishioners something like a "one-man university".[804] By comparing the structure of his thinking with that of Trubetskoi, we are able to provide it with greater coherence and systematisation. This enables us to better understand the contours of his thinking on biblical theology and interpretation, which is on the face of things fragmented across many different works, but in achieving this, it also closes a circle that Men himself wished to leave open. As he wrote to Reitlinger, Men did theology for others (3.5.1). When engaging with Scripture, he sought to raise questions rather than answer them.

мировоззрения князя С.Н. Трубецкого. http://ldn-knigi.lib.ru/R/Vern_Trub.htm [Accessed 17/12/2018].

802 Predein's view discussed in 3.6.2 above. Also Буфеев К. Об эволюционнистском богословии Тейяра де Шардена и протоиерея Александра Меня.

803 Мень А.прот. Русская религиозная философия, 91, Гайденко П.П. <Конкретный идеализм> С.Н. Трубецкого. 9, for example.

804 I am indebted to Canon Michael Bourdeaux for this image, who suggested it in conversation.

4) Aleksandr Men and Artistic Approaches to Biblical Interpretation

In the second of his letters to Harnack, Sergei Trubetskoi wrote that, for Russians, faith is not a matter of dogma, but of images (3.3). The concept of the holy 'image' or icon is central to the Russian Christian tradition, and the theological significance of the Medieval Russian iconography of Andrei Rublev and others for 'Russian school' thought, expressed in such works as Evgenii Trubetskoi's *Icons: Theology in Colour,*[805] is difficult to underestimate. Indeed, we remarked in 2.1.2 that Men sympathised with the Medieval Russian preference for expressing theology through paintings and music rather than academic study. For Men, just as for Medieval Russians, artistic productions provided a legitimate scriptural hermeneutic. In fact the genre provides a good example of how Men applied his interpretive principles.

In our discussion of the relationship between the biblical theologies of Sergei Trubetskoi and Men in Chapter Three above, it was claimed that certain passages of Scripture and indeed the overarching narrative of Scripture have an 'iconographic' quality. "In a similar way to the liturgy and ikon, the Bible is a whole world of ideas and forms, a complete organism, absorbing in itself a multiplicity of traditions."[806] Indeed, it is clear from Men's article on *Biblical Aesthetics* in his *Dictionary* that artistic approaches to scriptural interpretation, which should have an iconographic quality if they are to be effective, gain their validity from the iconographic nature of Scripture itself.[807] A study of biblical poetics is therefore invaluable for ascertaining the most appropriate artistic methods. That art may be said to have an iconographic quality corresponds with Solov′ev's divine-human understanding of biblical

[805] Trubetskoi, Evgenii, *Icons: Theology in Color,* trans. Vakar, Gertrude, (New York: SVS Press, 1973). Russian in Трубецкой Е.Н. Смысл жизни. 223-291.
[806] Мень А.прот. Исагогика, 42. (2.1.3).
[807] Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том третий. 468.

inspiration (2.2.2), since this emphasises the role of human creativity as a conduit for revelation.

Men's own engagement with art was extensive. He was a trained iconographer, and as a priest, celebrated the liturgy, which Florensky called "a synthesis of the arts", and this 'sacred art' is discussed in 4.1.1. Almost all his books include numerous drawings, paintings and photographs, which are discussed in 4.1.2 alongside his interest in other 'secular' formats such as music and cinema. 4.1.3 reflects on Men's hermeneutical approach and how this builds on the 'Romantic' hermeneutical notions of Schleiermacher concerning historicity and genius. Finally, citations of poetry are frequent in Men's work and his fascination with literary portrayals of Jesus Christ and other biblical characters finds expression in his 'religious histories'. 4.2 will consider these 'literary' portrayals of biblical characters and events, concluding that here, as elsewhere, the divine-humanity is central. Men's artistic interests complement his literary endeavours and both are closely related. The form of artistic representation is dialectically related to his theological understanding of the Person of Christ, taken from Sergei Trubetskoi.[808] The pastoral significance of this synthesis of form and content may be seen in the testimonies of his 'spiritual children'.

4.1) Tracing the Relationship between the Liturgy and Secular Art in Biblical Interpretation

4.1.1) The Liturgy as a Synthesis of the Arts[809]

The starting place for any discussion of art as biblical interpretation in Men's work is the

[808] This bears comparison with Men's discussion of the relationship between form and matter in the thought of Aristotle: Мень А.прот. Дионис, Логос, Судьба. 296-301.

[809] As well as a reference to Florensky, this was also the title of a lecture given by Men on 19.12.1989: https://yakov.works/library/13_m/myen/00105.html. [Accessed 21.04.2019].

Russian Orthodox liturgy. This Men considers in his book *Sacrament, Word and Image,* where he shows how the liturgy of the church, together with its architectural and aesthetic setting, incorporates the artistic disciplines as an expression of the spiritual in bodily and emotional form.[810] The Incarnation of Christ, the Word become flesh, is the necessary theological prerequisite for this, as it is this that affirms the value of our humanity. Men cites Florensky, who claims that the rite is the "harmonisation, the spiritualisation of our feelings and emotions".[811]

> If we set off on the path of battling our emotions then we will have to cast aside human nature itself.... Entering into a battle with emotions means one of two things: either it poisons humanity with internalised passions, or if it is successful it emasculates and deadens humanity, removing its vitality, power and finally, life itself. The rite acts differently: it asserts all... of human nature with all its emotions.

Men elaborates on this further.

> The words of prayers, hymns of thanksgiving and repentance, which have flowed from the depths of the hearts of great poets, mystics, saints, and seers are of the greatest value for us. Entering into them is a school of the soul. It disciplines us, enlightens and lifts us up. In church not only the "word" serves as a means for this enlightenment and purification, but the "image": the icon, melody, ritual action and the architecture of the church. Not in vain Florensky called the church liturgy a "synthesis of the arts". In its fullness it is addressed to all sides of the human personality.[812]

For Men, reading the prayers of the Church is a way of engaging with the spiritual world of their creators, in the same way that watching a film or listening to music helps the audience engage with the inner world of the artist.[813] Scriptural passages, expressed in hymns and the liturgy, and represented in iconography can be engaged with in the same way through this "synthesis of the arts".

---

[810] Мень А.прот. Таинство, слово и образ. 10.
[811] Мень А.прот. Таинство, слово и образ. 10. Флоренский П.А. Из богословского наследия – Богословские Труды. Сб.17. М.: 137.
[812] Мень А.прот. Таинство, слово и образ. 10-11.
[813] Еремин. А.А. Отец Александр Мень, 361.

Despite the importance accorded by the Russian Orthodox Church to the continuity of this synthesis, Men believed that the form and image should be distinguished from the sacramental content. Men was an enthusiastic advocate of Nikolai Afanas′ev's eucharistic ecclesiology (2.2.3.2), which emphasised the centrality of the Eucharist in the life and liturgy of the Church. These 'artistic' expressions of the sacramental core of ecclesial life are important, of great worth, yet they are nonetheless conditional; to be meaningful they need to be related to a divine-human ontology. The clearest expression of this divine-human ontology is found in Scripture, while its living reality is realised in believers at the Eucharist. The truth of Scripture, the theme that unifies it, is the divine-humanity in which believers participate when they eat the bread and drink the wine. Participating in the Eucharist and reading the Bible are therefore not only complementary activities that should not be opposed to each other, but part of the same divine-human whole.

While the Eucharist takes over much sacrificial imagery from the Old Testament, "historically the Christian church building was the successor of the synagogue, serving as a 'house of meeting', a place of prayer, preaching and reading the Word of God."[814] This should still be the case. In the liturgy there are readings from Scripture, the liturgical texts sung in the service take much of their material from the Psalms and Gospels, the icons depict biblical scenes and characters and even the actions of the priest are designed to remind believers of the biblical narrative.[815] In representing and interpreting the divine-human content of Scripture, the liturgy creates a world, a microcosm that seeks to transform the whole world through the communion of believers with Jesus Christ. Men's views on the universalising implications of liturgical interpretations of Scripture are consistent with Evgenii Trubetskoi's summary of the liturgical art of the Medieval Russian Church, which indicated its cosmic

[814] Мень А.прот. Таинство, слово и образ. 15.
[815] Мень А.прот. Таинство, слово и образ. 21.

pretensions. “The assembly of all creatures as the coming world of the whole, encompassing angels, people and all the breath of the earth: that is the basic church idea of our old religious art, that reigned in all our old architecture and pictorial art.”[816]

This fits well with the ecclesial principle for biblical interpretation as developed by Men (2.2.3, 3.5-6) and provides the ‘cosmic’ context for iconography, which Men saw as a development of Old Testament anthropomorphism and which the Fathers explicitly saw as a form of biblical interpretation for the illiterate.[817] Theodore the Studite wrote, for example, that “what is set forth in the Gospel on paper and in ink is depicted in the icon through various paints and other materials”[818] and Act 6 of the Seventh Ecumenical Council states that “what a word communicates through hearing is what art shows silently through an image.”[819] Men acknowledges this role for iconography in his *Dictionary* in the article *Iconography and Fresco Painting as Interpretation of the Bible*.[820]

Iconography, however, is more than a mere alternative method of communication. As Evgenii Trubetskoi states, “no words are able to put across the beauty and power of this incomparable language of religious symbols”.[821] Men, in his article, also discusses the symbolic character of icons and charts the development of iconographic canons and techniques from “conditional illustration to many-sided theological symbolism”,[822] especially in icons of the Trinity, in which after the period of Andrei Rublev, Abraham, Sarah and indeed all historical illustrative elements disappear. Men considers the most commonly encountered biblical

[816] Трубецкой Е.Н. Смысл жизни. 228.
[817] Мень А.прот. Трудный путь к диалогу, 323.
[818] St. Theodore the Studite, *Patrologia Graeca 99*, 340, Eng. trans. from Ilarion Alfeev: Theology of the Icon in the Orthodox Church. Lecture at St. Vladimir’s Seminary, 5 February 2011. https://mospat.ru/en/2011/02/06/news35783/#_ftn6 [Accessed 19.04.2019].
[819] Eng. trans. from Alfeev, Ilarion, ‘Theology of the Icon in the Orthodox Church’. Lecture at St. Vladimir’s Seminary, 5 February 2011. https://mospat.ru/en/2011/02/06/news35783/#_ftn6 [Accessed 19/04/2019].
[820] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый. 511-514.
[821] Трубецкой Е.Н. Смысл жизни. 225.
[822] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый. 512.

subject-matter: the Creation narrative, Elijah, and events from the Gospels, especially the Transfiguration, Crucifixion, Resurrection and Ascension. A clear example of symbolic interpretation may be found in icons of the Resurrection. The iconographers of the East, unlike their Western counterparts, did not depict the Resurrection directly. They either presented what the disciples saw, such as the empty grave, or the symbolic descent into hell. The gathered disciples at Pentecost, often including Paul(!), symbolically represent the universality of the Church. The Last Judgment tends to be depicted on the basis of texts from Daniel, Revelation or the Olivet Discourse (Matthew 24), which are themselves highly symbolic or even 'iconographic'; this is the case for Andrei Rublev's frescos for the Dormition Cathedral in Vladimir.[823] This symbolic approach, when seen in the context of biblical interpretation, again emphasises the divine-human quality of the Bible. On the one hand, the icon is a physical, artistic expression, created by humans. On the other, its avoidance of naturalism expresses the truth that lies beyond the material. "The pure colours, singing lines, unusual perspective and composition give birth to a special state in whoever meditates on an icon. He/she has partaken in eternal beauty, in the reality revealed to mystical vision."[824]

Men did not only write on the liturgy of the Church and its iconography. He was a priest who celebrated the liturgy,[825] painted icons, and supervised the repainting of an entire Church building at Alabino in the early 1960s.[826] He also corresponded with the elderly iconographer Sr. Ioanna Reitlinger, who became his 'spiritual daughter' (formerly a 'spiritual daughter' of

[823] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый. 513.

[824] Мень А.прот. Таинство, слово и образ. 16. Ilyushenko also summarises the contents of a slide-film no longer extant on the theme 'The Gospel in iconographic images': Илюшенко В.И. Отец Александр Мень, 393. He cites Men. "The icon does not wish to reflect nature. It puts across the inner substance of events of the spirit."

[825] Men writes to Reitlinger: "in a sense the divine service is a sacred theatre, and the priest an artist". Умное небо, 98.

[826] Daniel, Wallace *Russia's Uncommon Prophet,* 102. Протоиерей Александр Мень – художник. Сергиев Посад: «Дубрава», 2014. 88-91.

Fr. Sergius Bulgakov) and from whom he frequently commissioned new icons. He wrote to her a few of his thoughts.

> Many now... have completely mastered the technique of "pictorial art with tempera", but for them it is, in the final analysis, "art for art's sake", so to speak. Genuine Church painting was never like this. Behind it always stood spirit, ideas, strivings and church creativity. This is something I value in your work.[827]

Further, he writes, "I think that your creativity brings a particular contribution to the contemporary, very substantial searches for new forms in art. Here there is problem upon problem. And you spoke well about rea-symbolism. Basically here there is not only conditionality, but 'image'".[828] Men's three extant icons, of Archangel Michael, John the Baptist and the Apostle Paul are distinct in style from those of Reitlinger,[829] but clearly share many of the same artistic preoccupations. Men's icons are the mature works of a trained iconographer. He studied with Elena Vedernikova in 1959.[830] Speaking at an exhibition of Men's artistic endeavours in November 2014, Russian artist Artem Kirakosov expressed the view that

> the icons written by Fr. Aleksandr are a national achievement, a very significant spiritual occurrence in iconography.... They transfix the viewer with the fact that the saints represented on them are absolutely alive, have entered into his life: the Apostle Paul, the patron saint of his son the Archangel Michael, and John the Baptist (this last icon is permanently located in the Chapel of the Beheading of John the Baptist, built at the place of the death of Fr. Aleksandr, whose funeral took place on the day of the Beheading of the saint, 11th September).[831]

Thus not only are these works of considerable merit on their own terms, in trying to strike a divine-human balance between realism and symbolism, but deeply personal expressions, based on encounter with the biblical characters portrayed.

---

827 Умное небо, 48.
828 Умное небо, 69.
829 A number of these are at St. Anne's, Northampton, UK: https://saintannesnorthampton.weebly.com/reitlinger.html [Accessed 21/04/2019].
830 Протоиерей Александр Мень – художник. 86-87.
831 http://www.blagovest-info.ru/index.php?ss=2&s=4&id=60150 [Accessed 21/04/2019].

4.1.2) Secular Art as Biblical Interpretation

Although Men saw iconography as the highest art form,[832] his engagement with the arts went far beyond the boundaries of their liturgical expression. Ilyushenko comments on this. "Division into 'secular' and 'religious' in art was for Fr. Aleksandr very debatable and very doubtful."[833] Pictures of a beautiful landscape or even theatre and film could be just as spiritual as iconography, given the right combination of form and content. Indeed, almost all of his published books included, and in their current Russian editions include to this day, a combination of drawings by Men himself, pictorial art depicting the themes discussed (this includes, but is not limited to, iconography, and some of the iconography is Western), photos of sculptures or architecture or photos of relevant geographical locations and models of modern reconstructions (Jerusalem, Nineveh, Babylon etc.) In some works the use of such imagery is more extensive than in others, but it is only completely lacking in works that have been compiled either from his articles or from his lectures and *besedy* by his followers rather than Men himself. Its presence is particularly marked in his children's books and his compilation *Light and Life,*[834] which is divided into three parts that consider Creation, Jesus Christ and Church History. This volume contains text and imagery in almost equal measure and is designed to have a broad apologetic appeal. Men's love of presenting slide-films to his parishioners took the same approach further by adding a musical accompaniment to biblical words and imagery.[835]

The earliest typewritten editions of *Son of Man* from 1958-59 included many of Men's own

[832] Илюшенко В.И. Отец Александр Мень, 360.
[833] Илюшенко В.И. Отец Александр Мень, 228. Also Еремин. А.А. Отец Александр Мень, 136.
[834] Свет и жизнь, Брюссель: Жизнь с Богом, 1990. According to the title page, the project and part of the compilation were put together by Men.
[835] Chosen and edited by his son Mikhail: Мень М.А. "Чтобы умереть было не стыдно" - Новые заветы: самые известные люди России о своих мечтах, страхах и успехах. М.: "Русский пионер", 2016. 363.

illustrations, some of which were included in the exhibition of Men's work in November 2014.[836] There are pencil drawings of Jesus, the Apostles, and Mary. A typewritten page that includes a pencil illustration of Jesus walking on water and various images of Gospel scenes in the form of black and white silhouettes show how Men enabled the reader not only to understand, but to visualise the biblical narratives. Aleksandr Men's brother Pavel relates how when he started publishing books abroad through *La Vie avec Dieu* in Brussels in 1968, he began to collaborate on the imagery for his books with the artist Aleksandr Yulikov,[837] an abstract artist who had been one of the first members of the 'intelligentsia' to undertake the catechesis with Aleksandr Men in 1962 at Alabino.[838] Many of Men's books are still published with artistic and typographic contributions from Yulikov. Pavel Men, in his talk on the contribution of Yulikov to his brother's work, again emphasises that the world of the Bible has an iconographic quality that is many-layered. The illustrations in Men's books help to portray this quality to the reader, but they are effective precisely because they circumvent the need for words. Yulikov's comment that "what has significance and interest for me in pictorial art is that it is impossible to put across at the verbal level"[839] should introduce caution with respect to any analysis of this.

Nonetheless, we can determine certain characteristics. First, there is a significant desire to recreate the historical, geographical and cultural context of the subject-matter of the scriptural text for the reader. The latest Russian edition of *Son of Man,* which apparently includes minor changes to the illustrations while still representative of Men's intentions,[840]

[836] Протоиерей Александр Мень – художник. 106-113.

[837] Павел Мень Александр Юликов оформляет книги Александра Меня 30.03.2017 Открытие Выставки Вкчер at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gNtRWqT9kUA [Accessed 20.04.2019]. Aleksandr Yulikov is a well respected Russian artist. An interview with him is at https://www.colta.ru/articles/art/14530-aleksandr-yulikov-ya-ponimal-chto-budu-zanimatsya-chem-to-nepriznannym-neoplachivaemym-i-preslеduemym [Accessed 20.04.2019].

[838] Александр ЮЛИКОВ о работе на книгами Александра МЕНЯ Евгении ЗАВАДСКОЙ и в издательстве Искусст at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AmNjerlpt8k&list=PLWiyxSup4vrSJpVBs8cGg6UUr3XJgRKxi&index=3 [Accessed 20.04.2019].

[839] http://www.ncca.ru/events.text?id=12 [Accessed 20.04.2019].

[840] Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий, 496.

includes modern photographs of Bethlehem, Nazareth, the desert, the Jordan river, Galilee, ruins of the synagogue at Capernaum, Jacob's well, a fig tree, the entrance to the Pool of Siloam, fishermen on the Lake of Gennesaret, a boat on a lake, the Wailing Wall, the path up a mountain, the walls of Jerusalem, the grave of Lazarus and Bethany, grapes, coins, an oil lamp, Gethsemane, the steps from the house of Caiaphas to Kedron and Golgotha. A perusal of the six volumes of *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life* shows a similar approach. Photos include Mt. Sinai (in *Wellsprings* and *Magic Art and Monotheism*), the ruins of Assyrian palaces, Jerusalem, a shepherd, sheep, a menorah, ruins of a Jewish settlement near the Dead Sea, the Dead Sea, the port of Alexandria and a Roman aqueduct in Caesarea (in *Messengers* and *Threshold*). All these works include numerous pictures of model reconstructions of the various cities of the biblical narrative, which further add to the reader's understanding of context.

Second, Men appears to have been interested in portraying the events of Scripture, either through secular artistic representations, iconography or sculpture. If the photos of places and things display the 'human' historical, geographical and cultural aspects of the biblical narrative, then these pictures begin to engage with the spiritual significance of the 'events' of the biblical narrative. *Son of Man* includes icons of the entrance of Jesus into Jerusalem, the birth of Jesus, the Baptism of Jesus, the Wedding at Cana in Galilee, Jesus breaking bread, the Transfiguration, the raising of Lazarus, the Last Supper (twice), the kiss of Judas, the Crucifixion of Jesus (twice), the Descent into Hell, the Resurrection and the Great Commission. There is only one biblical event that has been illustrated using a work of secular art: Rembrandt's painting represents the dinner at Emmaus. There are, however, various stills from Franco Zefirelli's film *Jesus of Nazareth,* which Men rated very highly,[841] as well as a

[841] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том второй, 54. He writes "the representation of Christ in Zefirelli's film is held by film critics to be one of the most successful".

photo of an engraving of Titus entering Jerusalem. Again, *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life* includes similar portrayals of biblical events, including icons of Abraham's Sacrifice and Christ's Dedication at the Temple, although this time there are a greater number of illustrations from secular sources. These include illustrations by William Blake for the Book of Job, and prints of Mattathiah calling the people to revolt and the victory of Judas Maccabaeus by Gustav Doré.[842]

Finally, a third kind of picture included in Men's works portrays the individual characters of the biblical narrative. The artist Kirakosov believes in the value of Men's icons (4.1.1), precisely because they demand that those who view them enter into a living encounter with the saints portrayed; it seems from the incorporation into his 'religious histories' of these depictions that Men wished for readers to encounter in his books the saints of the biblical narrative in a similar way. Thus not only are they portrayed literarily with vitality, but they are presented to the reader pictorially. These portrayals play a similar role to the second group (pictures of biblical events) in that they engage with the spiritual aspect of the scriptures, while portraying personhood in a manner that the depictions of events do not.[843] In *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life,* many of these portrayals are taken from secular sources. Thus we have Rembrandt's Moses, Michelangelo's David, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Joel, Zechariah and Daniel, Doré's Amos, and Donatello's sculpture of Jeremiah. By way of contrast we only have iconographic portrayals of Elijah (15th century Russian), Hosea (Byzantine mosaic), Micah (Byzantine miniature), Enoch (fresco by Theophanes the Greek) and John the Baptist (Byzantine). In *Son of Man,* nearly all of the pictures of individual biblical characters are iconographic, even if some of the religious imagery is from the West.

[842] A *Dictionary* article is dedicated to Doré: Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый. 363-364.

[843] This emphasis on the depiction of personhood fits with Leonid Vasilenko's claim that Men was a Christian personalist: Илюшенко В.И. Отец Александр Мень, 72.

We are presented with iconographic images of Jesus Christ, Mary, John the Baptist and Peter. The reason for Men's reluctance to use secular art to depict Jesus Christ becomes clear when we read what Men has to say about the artist Aleksandr Smirnov's drawings for his children's book *Saviour* that recounts the Gospel narrative.

> Many illustrations that we find in countless editions of the Bible or New Testament unfortunately are without the power and significance that would correspond with their great subject. The artist, whose drawings have been included here, is one of the happy exceptions not only in Russian, but world graphic art. He has deeply felt and experienced what he has depicted. His drawings are free of vulgar "realism" and a preoccupation with novel experiments. Despite this they are distinguished by a surprising degree of spirituality. I want to believe that they will genuinely help the reader partake in the world of Gospel images.[844]

Men believed Jesus Christ was very difficult to represent in art, due to the challenge of adequately depicting his divine-humanity. While iconography set this as its specific task, few 'secular' artists have achieved anything convincing.

The challenges of depicting Jesus are partially carried over to any artistic representation of biblical events or characters, as, after all, the divine-humanity is the foundational truth of the scriptural witness, the basis of the Church and its sacraments, and the Truth that will transform the cosmos. Depicting prophets and apostles is challenging for secular artists, as they still have to grapple with the depiction of divine-humanity if they wish to penetrate the spiritual core of their subject-matter. Hence Men saw in art itself a prophetic quality, and believed this quality always appeared at its most intense when history and culture demanded it. "Great works of art – similarly to prophecy – frequently appeared in years of spiritual decline, while at the same time years of upsurge in faith were not always fruitful in pictorial art."[845] Articles in Men's *Dictionary* on 'pictorial art', cinema, music and theatre demonstrate that he believed not only iconography, but secular art could incorporate this prophetic

[844] Мень А.прот. Спаситель. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2005. 2.
[845] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый. 491.

element. This applied to obvious examples, such as the openly religious art of Michelangelo, Rafael, or Rembrandt,[846] or the compositions of J.S. Bach, but also to more controversial and contemporary artistic expressions, such as Dali's *Christ of St. John of the Cross*, the subject of a *beseda*,[847] and the music of Krzysztof Penderecki.[848] Indeed, if art's role was particularly heightened at times of Christian decline, then what time and context would be more appropriate for the artistic expression of the biblical truth than the Soviet Union of the 60s, 70s and 80s? Men also engaged with the non-traditional genres of theatre[849] and cinema,[850] although he clearly preferred the latter,[851] even appearing in the 1968 film *To Love* by director Mikhail Kalik.[852] The article *Contact*, which Men wrote on the films of Soviet director Andrei Tarkovsky in 1989,[853] demonstrates his considered engagement with the many layers of meaning in these cinematographic works of art. "His films are not only the product of mastery, but a personal confession, a brave experiment in symbolic autobiography."[854] Relating them explicitly to the Bible, he comments on their qualities.

> Most sharply of all, the problem of faith has been set before us in the biblical tradition, which was the nutrient-rich soil for the whole of European culture. The Bible does not strive for "an explanation of everything". For it faith is not simply logic, a theory about a cosmic Mind, and not a conception, destined only to explain the properties of nature and humanity. The Gospel, comprising the summit of the Bible, makes known the reality of Contact, and the universal completion, to which this Contact is directed. According to the Christian vision, the Universe and humanity have a purpose: to draw closer to their Proto-image, to their Creator. And this purpose is reached on the path of love for God and

[846] These are discussed in 'Pictorial Art and the Bible', together with a large number of other artists of all periods: Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый. 491-507.

[847] Мень А.прот. Мрак и свет: https://www.slovosnami.narod.ru/AMen.htm [Accessed 06/04/2019]. "Dali knew the tragedy of life. He understood that Chaos is hidden not only in the abyss, but in the human being. Pitilessly revealing the world of the subconscious, the artist displayed the Chaos that moves in its dimly-lit corners."

[848] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том второй, 240, 242. Krzysztof Penderecki's early music experiments with tone clusters and quarter tones, while avoiding traditional concepts of melody and rhythm. Blackwell, Albert L. *The Sacred in Music,* (Cambridge: The Lutterworth Press, 1999), 154: "I hear in Penderecki's music an aural acknowledgment of evil's reality and a deliberate rejection of Zarlino's musical principle that all should turn out well."

[849] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том третий. 213-215

[850] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том второй, 50-54.

[851] Илюшенко В.И. Отец Александр Мень, 360.

[852] His words from the film Любить can be found in Еремин. А.А. Отец Александр Мень, 326.

[853] Мень А.прот. Трудный путь к диалогу, 159–168. Men attended school with Tarkovsky: Q&A session after the lecture Христианство и творчество (05.02.1989), https://www.alexandermen.ru [Accessed 01.04.2019].

[854] Мень А.прот. Трудный путь к диалогу, 159-160.

people. The Apostle Paul says that if a human being has come to know all the mysteries and accomplished unthinkable acts of faith, but does not have love then he/she is "a sounding gong".[855] These words are voiced in Tarkovsky's film "Andrei Rublev".[856] And it is not coincidence that in "Solaris" we see Rublev's "Trinity" on board the space station. The creations of Russian iconography are the greatest symbol of divine Love, that love, which, according to Dante, "moves the Sun and stars".[857]

Thus Men, is able to explain the link between contemporary cinema, Russian iconography and the heart of the Bible's message, demonstrating the organic continuity of sacred and secular art to a greater extent than his 'Russian school' predecessors. The art of a controversial Soviet film director, in the manner of a contemporary prophecy for a nation deprived of its faith, is able to interpret and express Scripture in a way that reveals the many layers of its meaning to viewers. If this is the case, then it validates, even requires, Men's own use of artistic representations – illustrations in his books, slide-films and music – to put across the Gospel message.

4.1.3) The Hermeneutic Implications of Biblical Interpretation in Art

In explicating the relationship between secular and sacred art and how it might be said to 'interpret' Scripture, Hans-Georg Gadamer's *Truth and Method,* especially the section entitled *The Ontology of the Work of Art and its Hermeneutic Significance* gives one point of orientation. There we read "… the difference between the sacred and the secular is relative in a work of art. Even an individual portrait, if it is a work of art, shares in the mysterious radiation of being that flows from the being of what is represented, what comes to presence there."[858] Gadamer has, it seems, similar views to Men on the relationship of sacred and secular art, and the interpretive potential of portraits. His statement that "a work of art

[855] 1 Corinthians 13:1.
[856] Alexander Waintrub's article 'Speaking icons' discusses the connection between this film, the aesthetic of Evgenii Trubetskoi's 'Theology in Color' and Andrei Rublev's iconography: Waintrub, Alexander, 'Speaking icons', *Word & Image 18:3,*(2002), 99-104.
[857] Мень А.прот. Трудный путь к диалогу. 167.
[858] Gadamer, Hans-Georg, *Truth and Method*, 143.

belongs so closely to what it is related to that it enriches the being of that as if through a new event of being"[859] bears comparison with Men's account of the universalising tendencies of the ecclesiality of scriptural interpretation (2.2.3). Men's practice of interlacing pictorial art and text means that readers, when confronted with *Son of Man* or *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life,* or viewers when seeing Men's icons, are invited to commune with the ontological content of that work in such a way that the Truth of Scripture comes alive for them anew, adding something to the text in the same way that the Church's interpretation of Scripture brings new meaning and new weight.[860] Despite Men's emphasis on ecclesiology, in effect, both Gadamer and Men have a strongly holistic approach to hermeneutics, where aesthetics is incorporated into the interpretive process.

Men's interest in recreating the whole context of the biblical text, using illustrations, art and photos of certain items and geographical locations has far more in common with Schleiermacher than Gadamer, however. For Schleiermacher,

> any given piece of text needs to be interpreted in light of the whole text to which it belongs, and both need to be interpreted in light of the broader language in which they are written, their larger historical context, a broader pre-existing genre, the author's whole corpus, and the author's overall psychology.[861]

In all of these things, Schleiermacher's approach is almost identical to that of Men. Unsurprisingly, therefore, we find that Men writes on Schleiermacher that his hermeneutics are a "valuable contribution to biblical science, and likewise to general hermeneutical theory."[862] Framing his 'psychological' approach to interpretation, Men tells us the following.

---

[859] Gadamer, Hans-Georg, *Truth and Method*, 141.
[860] Gadamer, Hans-Georg, *Truth and Method*, 137.
[861] Forster, Michael, 'Friedrich Daniel Ernst Schleiermacher' (2002, rev.2017) in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2017 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/schleiermacher/#HermIeTheoInte [Accessed 22.04.2019].
[862] Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том третий. 429.

> The interpreter should take into account that the text of the Bible and any other artefact depends on the specificities of its language just as much as the personal specificities of its author. These two factors create "tension", they battle with each other and complement each other. The process of understanding has a creative character and demands an intuitive accustomization to the text at the same time as its analysis. Hermeneutics presupposes a kind of exegetical art. It helps see in the text deep layers that perhaps even the author has not fully recognised. The "grammatical" exegesis is oriented on the laws of language, and the "psychological" [exegesis] is directed towards the specificities of the author.[863]

Thus both historical enquiry and personal creativity have a role in interpretation for Men as for Schleiermacher. Men would not have had much sympathy for Gadamer's critique of Schleiermacher's interest in the 'historical'.

> Reconstructing the original circumstances, like all restoration, is a futile undertaking in view of the historicity of our being. What is reconstructed, a life brought back from the lost past, is not the original. In its continuance in an estranged state it acquires only a derivative, cultural existence.[864]

Perhaps Men had this in mind when he dismissed Gadamer's hermeneutics as "extra-historical interpretations" that dissolve the content of the Word of God into amorphous existential states.[865] Men is also unlikely to have been convinced by Gadamer's extended criticism of the 'Romantic' notion of genius, both in *The Aesthetics of Genius and the Concept of Experience*[866] for its idealist presumptions and in his discussion *The Work of Art and Its Hermeneutic Significance* as a way of distinguishing between the merely decorative and the work of art.[867] In contrast, for Schleiermacher the concept of the "virtuoso of religion" and his/her genius is a significant step towards understanding the Person of Jesus Christ,[868] and influences much later nineteenth-century christological thought, including that of Harnack (3.2). Men, of course, wished to give a stronger account of the divine-humanity than either Schleiermacher or Harnack, but he does appear to view the concept of genius

[863] Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том третий. 430.
[864] Gadamer, Hans-Georg, *Truth and Method*, 159.
[865] 2.1.3.3.
[866] Gadamer, Hans-Georg, *Truth and Method*, 49-70.
[867] Gadamer, Hans-Georg, *Truth and Method*, 152.
[868] Schleiermacher uses this term 15 times in the first edition of his *Speeches:* Schleiermacher, Friedrich, *On Religion: Speeches to its Cultured Despisers,* 1st ed, trans. Richard Crouter, 2nd ed, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

positively when applied to inspirational religious mystics or artists, even if he uses the term infrequently.

> Perhaps the difference between the God-knowledge of religious genii, such as Francis of Assisi, Teresa of Avila, Meister Eckhart and Seraphim of Sarov, and people of the ordinary level is in the fact that for the latter encounter with God is like a sudden flash of lightning, beyond which darkness returns once again, while the former communed with the divine life with their whole being and themselves became its carriers.[869]

Given Men's reliance on Solov′ev's divine-human hermeneutic, and the dependence of that hermeneutic on the concept of genius, especially in his Shakespeare analogy (2.2.2), it should come as no surprise that Men is sympathetic.[870] There is little sense that Men knew the criticisms of Gadamer, or Louth, who claims that the nineteenth-century "music of the virtuoso, the art of the genius" alienates "art from any real context in life".[871] Such criticisms have a certain strength when applied to the aesthetics of nineteenth-century Europe. Yet, in the works of the Russian religious philosophers, this concept is primarily related not to a psychological account of the person, but reworked under the theological concept of the 'Image of God' (Genesis 1:27). Bulgakov writes in his *Unfading Light,* a work Men knew well,

> every true work of art is in this sense a miracle, and first of all for the one who accomplished it, for he accomplished it not by his own power, not in his psychological limitedness but by being expelled from it into the mysterious deep of his essence.... The charms of art are dispatched rarely and sparingly, but in the depth of every human soul is hidden its thirst, and consequently its artistic endowment.[872]

In realising the image of God inside him/herself, the creative artist is engaging in a kenotic process. Even if what Men calls 'genius' makes a habit of perfecting this kenotic process, it is in fact an expression of a universal human calling. It is for this reason that Men can say that

---

[869] Мень А.прот. Истоки религии, 94. My translation.
[870] With respect to Scripture, something similar may be found in Bulgakov, Sergius, *Unfading Light,* 390.
[871] Louth, Andrew, *Discerning the Mystery*, 1-2.
[872] Bulgakov, Sergius, *Unfading Light*, 366.

"religion, art, and ethics *live* in humanity, rather than develop in the evolutionary sense."[873]

Consequently, Men claims, for example, that even cave art has high artistic value, despite the savagery of the ancient human, prehistoric, form of life. "This advanced art belongs to the most ancient period of humanity, and... decline set in during the next epoch."[874] What cave-men painted on their caves no technology, no matter how sophisticated, is capable of reproducing.[875] Machines can "only create a lifeless parody of genuine creativity", because genuine creativity is an expression of the boundless riches of human spiritual being, which are in turn found in the human identity as made in the Image of God.[876] In *Magic Art and Monotheism,* Men tells us that creative artists are instruments of divinity that create their own new world, reflecting as 'images' of God the world created by God Himself.[877] Thus Men, like Bulgakov, reinterprets the nineteenth-century concept of artistic and religious genius with theological anthropology. Art that is truly kenotic is also truly creative and adds to the divine-human world it interprets. If works of apparent artistic genius lack the kenotic quality, and forget true human identity, the Image, then the result will be the "demonic in art". Such art is recognised by its destructive quality and could in principle be sacred art in terms of its thematics, just as much as secular.[878] By way of contrast, true works of art, even if secular in origin, have an eschatological quality, as they represent the spiritual culture of Christ's coming Kingdom, the divine-human culture.

---

873 Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие, 544.

874 Men, Alexander, *The Wellsprings of Religion*, 192.

875 Technology may have a place as an 'extension' of physical human capabilities, including in the artistic sphere, but this role is always subject to the creative power of the human spirit. Men (Магизм и единобожие, 544-5) interprets an idea of Henri Bergson: Бергсон. А. Творческая эволюция, М.: 1914, 185.

876 Мень А.прот. Истоки религии, 169.

877 Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие, 545. Also Истоки религии, 170-71.

878 Men explained that Scriabin achieved the 'demonic' in his music without any recourse to rock music, condemned by some of his ecclesiastical contemporaries: Илюшенко В.И. Отец Александр Мень, 226. Men believed that art could have inherent spiritual value and abhorred the kind of postmodernist approach that attributes equal value to very different artistic expressions: Илюшенко, 329.

4.2) Art as Literature in Biblical Interpretation

In comparison with the religious art of ancient Egypt and Babylon, the Bible presents a different, more dynamic, interpretation of the world as becoming and striving towards a goal. The biblical *olam* moves in time. Therefore in the Bible artistic portrayals of divine actions are given to us in the form of literature, in which a narrative may be established. The universe has beauty, but as the dynamic stream of the Divine Economy rather than as finished stasis, born in a creative act and moving towards a new creation. Images, such as those used in apocalyptic texts, are often poetic and expressive, and not easily realised in the plastic arts.[879] Thus, despite the incarnational justification of pictorial art at the Seventh Ecumenical Council in 787, it is still literary art that finds the greatest continuity with the artistic expressions of the Bible itself.

Yet literary art, as Gadamer recognises, has its own peculiarities. In particular, he reflects on what distinguishes a literary work of art from any other text, a discussion which has particular relevance for whether the Bible can itself be understood as 'literary art'. The Bible, of course, incorporates a huge variety of different texts, from the poetic (Psalms, prophets and New Testament hymn forms), which are more readily seen as 'artistic' to historical accounts and personal letters. That parts of the Bible can be understood as 'literary art' is uncontroversial; it is difficult, however, to claim this distinction for the Bible as a whole even in the broadest sense. Just how important this distinction is for our purposes is open to debate. Gadamer's critique of aesthetic consciousness leads him to say that the "principle dividing literary art from other written texts" on the basis of perceived literary merits

[879] Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том третий. 469.

"becomes dubious for us".[880] He acknowledges that there is a difference between the languages of poetry, prose and "scholarly" prose, but this is a difference of literary form rather than a question of artistic merit. He tells us: "...when texts are understood by, say, a historian, that is not so very different from their being experienced as art. And it is not mere chance that the concept of literature embraces not only works of literary art, but everything passed down in writing."[881] "Literature is a function of being intellectually preserved and handed down, and therefore brings its hidden history into every age."[882]

The Bible, even if stylistically diverse, and of variable artistic merit, is certainly a set of texts that have been intellectually preserved and handed down, such that these texts have become models for much later literature to an extent without parallel. Men, to begin with, engages with biblical poetry, citing it extensively in his 'religious histories' (in Russian translation) and even briefly presents and analyses the most significant literary techniques of Hebrew poetry in his *Dictionary* article on *Biblical Poetics*.[883] The Psalmists and Prophets have become a model insofar as interpretation requires further poetic expression of the truths of Scripture. Thus Men was keen to recite poems on biblical themes written by the Russian writers of the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth centuries, bridging the artistic, literary and cultural gap between the biblical texts and his audiences. Perhaps the best example of this can be found in the lectures published as *The Bible and Literature.* There he recited Lomonosov's poetic interpretation of the Book of Job,[884] Derzhavin's poem to the Creator God[885] and poetic representation of encounter with Jesus Christ,[886] Pushkin's 'Prophet',[887] Lermontov's

[880] Gadamer, Hans-Georg, *Truth and Method*, 155.
[881] Gadamer, Hans-Georg, *Truth and Method*, 156.
[882] Gadamer, Hans-Georg, *Truth and Method*, 154.
[883] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том второй, 475-8.
[884] Мень А.прот. Библия и литература. 108-9.
[885] Мень А.прот. Библия и литература. 124-7.
[886] Мень А.прот. Библия и литература. 128-9.
[887] Мень А.прот. Библия и литература. 138.

'Prophet',[888] a number of poems by Khomyakov including one inspired by a reading of Psalm 50,[889] a number of poems by Solov′ev that incorporate Old Testament themes,[890] poems by Andrei Belyi that attempt to understand the events of 1917 in biblical language,[891] and a number of other poems by such figures as Esenin, Voloshin and Pasternak. Certainly for Men's 'spiritual children', many of whom were either well-known poets themselves (for example, Nadezhda Mandelstam) or at least members of the 'intelligentsia', this would have had apologetic significance. Ilyushenko, for example, saw great value in Men's use of poetry to express the truths of Scripture, even claiming that his recitative techniques required further investigation.[892] Ilyushenko, in his book on Men, also includes a collection of poems that he had originally presented to him as a gift,[893] suggesting the expression of faith through poetry was common not only in Men's work, but in Men's 'circle'.

Men's interests in interpreting Scripture through literary art were not limited to poetic expression, however. Considering his interest in the pictorial presentations of biblical characters, especially iconography (4.1), it should come as no surprise that he was also interested in the literary portrayal of these same characters. The biblical model for this kind of literature is found in the Gospels, which according to Men, occupy a 'literary-ecclesial' genre that is not purely biography or even history in the standard sense.[894] Describing their literary character, he tells us that "the four Gospels are set apart by a surprising austerity and succinctness, sometimes bordering on documentalism. The expressive means of the Evangelists are scanty and moralising commentaries are lacking."[895] Yet they are hugely

[888] Мень А.прот. Библия и литература. 141.
[889] Мень А.прот. Библия и литература. 145-7.
[890] Мень А.прот. Библия и литература. 187-92.
[891] Мень А.прот. Библия и литература. 269-283.
[892] Илюшенко В.И. Отец Александр Мень, 395.
[893] Илюшенко В.И. Отец Александр Мень, 465-486.
[894] Мень А.прот., Как читать библию. Часть третья. 367.
[895] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый. 384.

effective in representing not only the factual details of Christ's life, but his Person.[896] Men was fascinated by the many more recent attempts to portray the figure of Jesus Christ in literature, especially those that sought to answer the questions of the modern world, but as with the pictorial representations, he considered few of them effective.

Thus we can find in Men's published works many texts referring to authors who have sought to present the life of Jesus Christ. His article *In Search of the Genuine Christ*,[897] which gives a summary of the history of such attempts, is the most extended consideration of the matter. Pride of place is given to Ernest Renan, whose *Life of Jesus* (1863) is assessed as a novel that uses 'contrasts' to ineffectively express only the human side of the Person of Christ. Men has some sympathy for the writer and his desire to bring the historical Jesus to life, following the more analytical work of David Strauss and others. Yet he is unconvinced by the results. He expresses his consternation.

> Who did the French novelist depict? A weak person, easily giving in to the influence of others, living with illusions and the naïve doctrines of days long gone.... It is impossible to imagine that the hero of this novel set the foundation of a great world religion that has changed the course of history.[898]

Renan is also discussed at length and his work subjected to similar criticisms in Men's article *Two Interpreters of Gospel History*,[899] his *Dictionary* article *Renan, Joseph Ernest*,[900] his lecture *The Bible and Western literature of the Nineteenth-century*,[901] and even in the author's introduction to *Son of Man.*[902]

---

[896] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый. 403. Also Трудный путь к диалогу. 170
[897] Мень А.прот. В поисках подлинного Христа – Библия и литература. 368-415: https://predanie.ru/book/73194-v-poiskah-podlinnogo-hrista/ [Accessed 21.04.2019].
[898] Мень А.прот. В поисках подлинного Христа, 383-384.
[899] Мень А.прот. Трудный путь к диалогу. 339-353.
[900] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том третий. 29-32.
[901] Мень А.прот. Библия и литература. 209-217.
[902] Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий. 8-10.

The reason for Men's attention to Renan can be found in the latter's influence over most subsequent literary attempts to depict the life of Jesus. Men continues his essay *In Search of the Genuine Christ* by summarising a variety of such attempts by Flaubert, Wilde (in *De Profundis*) and others to portray Jesus Christ, concluding that most of these are indebted to Renan. Things only begin to change, and at that not very significantly, with the 'historical' account of Harnack, and then Schweitzer's attempts to critically assess the history of the genre. For Men, Schweitzer's *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* (1906) is a deeply paradoxical occurrence.

> In following the reconstructions of Gospel history in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Schweitzer persuaded himself that novelists and historians were equally subjective. Every one of them saw in the Gospel only what he wanted, what his views suggested to him.... Schweitzer himself did not withstand the temptation and at the end of his book gave his own version of the life of Christ, not far removed from the "liberal" account he had opposed.[903]

Like Renan, Schweitzer is discussed and subjected to critique in a number of places in Men's works, including the article *Two Interpreters of Gospel History*,[904] and his *Dictionary* article *Schweitzer, Albert*.[905]

Later twentieth-century attempts include the Yeshua Ha-Nozri of Mikhail Bulgakov's *The Master and Margarita,* which Men did not consider successful as a portrayal of Jesus Christ, even if the character works in Bulgakov's broader literary plan.[906] Men also devoted an entire article to Miguel Otero Silva's *La Piedra que era Cristo,* even though he also considered this equally unsuccessful in its primary intentions.[907] Towards the end of his article *In Search of the Genuine Christ*, he writes that out of all the twentieth-century literary attempts to portray Jesus Christ, the most successful was the lion Aslan in C.S. Lewis's *The Chronicles of*

[903] Мень А.прот. В поисках подлинного Христа. 395-396.
[904] Мень А.прот. Трудный путь к диалогу. 353-361.
[905] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том третий. 409-415.
[906] Мень А.прот. Библия и литература. 312-321.
[907] Мень А.прот. Трудный путь к диалогу. 169-184.

Narnia, despite being written for children and having a strictly symbolic character.

Men's own book *Son of Man* may be seen as a contribution to this 'life of Jesus' genre, designed specifically for the Soviet reader. In it, he clearly attempts to stay very close to the words and narrative of the Gospels, without adding psychological or other inessential details, at least to the character of Jesus Himself. Many of the more expressive elements of the book are concerned not with His personality, but His historical context, and the psychological aspects of others' responses to encounter with Him. The Person of Christ can only be characterised as mystery. Thus, for example, when discussing His prayers in Gethsemane Men writes the following.

What did the Son of Man experience when he lay on the cold ground in spiritual anguish? Could this be merely natural fear before tortures and death? But weaker men have conquered this. Why did the One who will be the support for millions falter in this way? It is not given to us to penetrate the depths of this deathly struggle....[908]

In this most personal of moments in the Gospel accounts, Men does not try to interpret, but merely lets the 'mystery' stand and claims that it is not for us to understand what is happening. This approach, of course, has both positive and negative implications, and tends merely to create 'form' for theological content. Here Men invites comparison with Robert Powell's portrayal of Jesus Christ in Franco Zefirelli's *Jesus of Nazareth,* in which the actor and director similarly sought to avoid adding psychological interpretation to the character of Jesus. In interview Powell later made these claims.

The reason for Jesus' success over 2,000 years plus is the fact that he is whoever you wish him to be. He is not a person. He is not a person with characteristics or idiosyncrasies or mannerisms, you can

[908] Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий. 262.

impose on him whatever you like. However you wish your Jesus to be, that is your Jesus, and that is why people can take him with them wherever they go and everybody has a different one, a different image in their head. I think that that's what we allowed in our film. The tens of thousands of letters that we got all said the same thing, "it's exactly how I imagined him to be," on that level we succeeded in spades, we really did. We managed to make it so non-specific.[909]

In avoiding Jesus' human psychology and interpretation of his words and actions, both Men and Powell left room for others to make recourse to the explanatory force of divine mystery. At the same time, the question of content is left open by such portrayals. Men and Powell have much in common in their artistic method of presenting Jesus, and it is therefore unsurprising that Men had great respect for this film. Yet their interpretations of the Person of Christ differ greatly.[910] For Powell, the content and interpretation is provided by the viewers of his film. Christ does not actually have a 'Person'. If there is a 'mystery' then it is purely anthropological and located in the viewers themselves. For Men there is a concrete mystery to be found in the Person of Jesus. The mystery is real and it is theological. Thus it is Men's theological account, derived from Sergei Trubetskoi's philosophy and biblical theology that really stands at the heart of his understanding of Christ. Literary portrayal provides the clothing of form for it that operates in dialectical relation to the theological content. It should therefore come as no surprise that in his criticism of Renan, Tolstoy, Schweitzer and others, Men constantly returns to Trubetskoi's account of Jesus to show how the Person of Jesus is really to be understood.[911]

It is the divine-humanity of the Russian religious philosophers that stands at the centre of Men's understanding of the identity of Jesus, interpreted by Trubetskoi as concrete and living God-consciousness. Likewise, it is to this christological concept that Men appeals in *Son of*

[909] https://www.history.co.uk/shows/robert-powell-the-real-jesus-of-nazareth/articles/speaking-for-jesus-an-interview-with-robert [Accessed 21.04.2019].
[910] Parallels Sergei Lezov (1.1.5.3), who rejected Men's christocentric theology.
[911] Мень А.прот. Трудный путь к диалогу. 255 for Trubetskoi vs. Tolstoy on Jesus; 351 for Trubetskoi vs. Renan on Jesus; 359-360 for Trubetskoi vs. Schweitzer on Jesus.

Man to characterise Christ.[912] Men's other literary portrayals of biblical characters, found in *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life* and *The First Apostles,* are closely related to his literary portrayal of Christ, as they also seek to portray the divine-human element of their callings. Four examples demonstrate well the interplay between the divine and human elements of Men's character sketches, remarkable for what Dobykin and Tarnakin call their "use of striking and expressive imagery" (1.2.2). First, In Men's account of Moses in *Magic Art and Monotheism,* while paying full attention to the historical context, he reflects on Moses' mysterious encounter with God at the Burning Bush, and emphasises the revelation to Moses of the divine mystery that changed his life forever.[913] Second, In *Messengers of the Kingdom,* Men reconstructs Jeremiah's context at the court of King Joakim, and various possible political intrigues involving Pharoah Neco, while at the same time accentuating the divine demand on the prophet's life. His commitment to the living God forces him to deliver prophecy after prophecy, such that he cannot avoid becoming increasingly unpopular both with the king and the religious authorities of his day.[914] Third, in *On the Threshold of the New Covenant,* John the Baptist, who as we ascertained in 4.1.2 had great personal significance for Men, is described as having an "irrepressible spiritual power"; his popularity and sudden appearance could not be explained simply by appealing to the contingencies of political and religious crisis in first-century Palestine.[915] Despite this emphasis on the divine nature of John's calling, Men uses the accounts of Flavius Josephus and pays great psychological attention to what Herod Antipas might have thought of the prophet.[916] Fourth, in *The First Apostles,* the Apostle Paul's family background and studies with Gamaliel are discussed, but the divine calling on his life, given on the road to Damascus is expressed as a deep mystery. "All is lost in speculation", Men tells us.[917] Thus the whole of the Bible, not just the Gospel

[912] For example, Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий. 255.
[913] Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие, 300-302.
[914] Мень А.прот. Вестники, 250-273.
[915] Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового завета. книга II. 266.
[916] Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового завета. книга II. 264-5.
[917] Мень А.прот. Первые Апостолы. 84. Men was interested in Paul. In addition to an extensive article on

accounts of Jesus Christ, reveals the divine-humanity to us in the way God revealed Himself to His people throughout sacred history. In his literary portrayals, Men emphasises the mystery of the divine calling at work in the life of each biblical character, while nonetheless paying attention to the 'human' historical context that determines how that divine calling is realised. These literary accounts are designed to bring biblical characters to life in a new way, but Men's central intention in providing them is to lead his readers to an encounter with the divine-humanity of Jesus Christ, the concrete personal content of the Bible's message. In this way, these accounts also have an 'iconographic' quality. Just as an icon may simply be viewed as a painting on the wall, Men's literary portrayals may simply be read as 'information' or indeed 'literature', but if approached in prayer they will aid encounter with the personal revelatory centre of Scripture.

4.3) General Summary

Using Pavel Florensky's idea of the liturgy as a "synthesis of the arts" and Evgenii Trubetskoi's reflections on the theological significance of iconography as his sources, Men saw his celebration of the Russian Orthodox liturgy and icon painting as the highest artistic expression. This was an artistic expression with cosmological significance that reflected Men's application of the ecclesial principle of biblical interpretation. Thus he was keener than most of his 'Russian school' forebears to chart not only the Eucharistic and sacramental source of this liturgy, but its scriptural basis. At the centre of the scriptural witness is the divine-humanity, and the believer partakes of this when he/she takes the bread and the wine at the Eucharist.

Paul's Letters in his *Dictionary* and a separate English-language article on his eschatology, (Bibliography 1.2.35), he gave space in his *Dictionary* to Glubokovskii's accounts of the Apostle (Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый. 263-266).

It is clear, however, that Men did not draw a solid boundary between sacred and secular art. This he had in common with Gadamer, but for different reasons. Men believed that such boundaries, the result of the Fall, could be overcome by the creation of divine-human culture, reflected in the ecclesial nature (as defined by Men, see 2.2.3) of artistic interpretation. Secular art has a relative significance that may be transformed by the divine-humanity into something absolute, irrespective of style or genre. Even contemporary art, such as the films of Tarkovsky and the music of Penderecki, could reflect the divine-humanity of scriptural truth. Indeed, Men worked with an abstract artist, Aleksandr Yulikov, to illustrate his own books. Men's attempts to reconcile the sacred and the secular were therefore more daring than those of his 'Russian school' predecessors. Art of all kinds provided form, which was dialectically related to content as a means of encounter.

Unlike Gadamer, Men was very interested in historical reconstruction, attributing to it real hermeneutic significance in his 'religious histories', both in the text and illustrations, in the manner of Schleiermacher. For this reason, the elucidation of a coherent biblical theology was of great importance in providing interpretive principles. Neither was he prepared to sacrifice Schleiermacher's concept of genius either in art or spirituality to Gadamer's critique. That said, in his works this genius is reinterpreted kenotically. The artist, made in the image of God, gives himself over to divine inspiration and leading in the creative act. Here we see parallels with Solov′ev's application of Cappadocian theological anthropology to biblical interpretation. If genius is related to the creativity of the human soul or *ratio,* then historical contextualisation is related to the physicality of the human body (2.2.2).

Thus Mens use of art as a form of biblical interpretation clearly demonstrates his application of the two most significant of his interpretive principles. The cosmological universality of his

ecclesial principle is demonstrated by his inclusion of both secular and sacred art in divine-human culture and the christological nuances of his divine-human principle are demonstrated by his simultaneous interests in historical contextualisation and human genius. Indeed the divine-human principle is necessarily ecclesial in its application and vice versa.

The pastoral implications of these ideas may be seen in Men's application of poetic and novelistic interpretations of scripture in a very large number of articles and lectures. He was keen to recite poetry in his lectures and in meetings with his parishioners and he attempted to provide Russian readers with 'living' literary accounts of biblical figures that took into account both the human psychological and historical aspects of there stories, together with the divine-human mystery with which they were suffused. He saw his own literary portrayal of Jesus Christ in *Son of Man* as central to his written work (1.2.3). Yet in avoiding the portrayal of psychological and incidental aspects of Jesus' character he risked making Him into a 'non-Person'. In this respect, the theological account of the Person of Christ provided by Sergei Trubetskoi was of absolutely central importance.

For Men all art is iconographic in the sense that it is a medium, or a portal, through which questions may be asked, and answers may be found. Men's use of art, poetry, film and music to interpret Scripture for his parishioners had a significant pastoral role. Mikhail Men writes about his father Aleksandr.

> He was a person of encyclopaedic knowledge and, of course, was able to knock you down with arguments, but he acted differently. He led me and my sister to the correct conclusion, he suggested reading a book or article or watching a film, and then he discussed it with you. This was a very important characteristic of his, and he used it with his parishioners.[918]

Aleksandr Men used art as a way of helping his hearers and readers come to their own

[918] Мень М.А. "Чтобы умереть было не стыдно". 362.

conclusions, and this approach had much in common with Socratic Method, as described by Men in *Dionysus, Logos, Fate,*[919] a topic which in itself deserves study beyond the scope of our present discussion.[920]

[919] Мень А.прот. Дионис, Логос, Судьба. 175-226.

[920] Илюшенко В.И. Отец Александр Мень, 266-267 and 274-275 and Еремин. А.А. Отец Александр Мень, 467-8 discuss Men's relation to the Socratic Method. Both 'spiritual children' held that Men was a follower of Socrates, not Plato like some other Russian religious philosophers.

Conclusion

The introduction to this study discussed the diversity in characterisations of Aleksandr Men. Although the Bible and its interpretation was clearly of central importance to him, there are many other aspects of both his writing and pastoral ministry that are not straightforwardly included within a discussion of his biblical interpretation. In characterising Men as an 'interpreter of the Bible' we merely wish to claim that this is one possibility among many that is productive in offering explanations of a number of his other interests. His approach to biblical interpretation brings together his pastoral ministry, his priestly ministry in celebrating the Eucharist, his thinking on the Church, his interest in 'Russian school' philosophy, his views on social change and his interest in the arts. All of these areas could be subject to much further study.

Chapter One considered from the perspective of his biography, legacy and works what kind of potential this characterisation as an 'interpreter of the Bible' might have, and Chapter Two started to discuss what kind of 'interpreter' Men was by considering his relationship to broader trends within 'Russian Orthodox' biblical interpretation. Both chapters, but especially Chapter Two, remarked on the close relationship between Men's principles of biblical interpretation and his biblical theology. Indeed, his biblical theology may be seen as a realisation of his interpretive principles, especially his ecclesial principle (2.2.3). Chapter Three attempted to chart the commonalities between the biblical theologies of Sergei Nikolaevich Trubetskoi and Aleksandr Men and in so doing explained that Men's biblical theology also provided the philosophical foundations for his interpretive principles. This may appear to result in a circle, with biblical interpretation and theology deriving principles from each other, but in fact, due to Men's 'linear' account of sacred history, the movement between

interpretation and theology resembles a spiral. The resulting account is circular only in the same sense as Schleiermacher's 'hermeneutical circle', as it involves a dialectical relationship between the parts and the whole of the text. In Men's case this relationship builds explicitly on Solov′ev's philosophical notion of 'all-unity', which is a way of explaining the relationship between parts and the whole, and his divine-human account of divine inspiration, which is in turn related to Cappadocian theological anthropology and Romantic notions of genius and the importance of historical analysis. Chapter Four explained how artistic interpretation in Men's work and ministry presents us with a clear application of his interpretive principles, especially the divine-human and ecclesial principles. Artistic interpretation aides encounter with Christ by presenting a dialectic of artistic form, connected with its technical side, and theological content presented as beauty. In so doing, it realises the transformative power of the Person of Christ in the world, creating a universal divine-human culture, the final eschatological realisation of which is presented in Scripture as the millennial kingdom of Revelation 20:1-10. Pertinent here is Sergius Bulgakov's statement that art "shows what the soul thirsts and longs for, by revealing the creation in the light of the Transfiguration",[921] and Men would certainly agree that art provides the present image of the manner in which all will finally be freely united in their worship of Christ, which is a mysterious "call from another world".[922]

The 'universalising pathos' of this divine-human culture is able to overcome the divisions of human society that result from the Fall. First and foremost among these divisions are the hard boundaries established between different spiritual cultures, which are relativised and revealed as conditional states by divine-human culture. In Men's work, we may observe a particular interest in non-Christian religions, especially pre-Christian religions, and this has been

[921] Bulgakov, Sergius, *Unfading Light*, 365.
[922] Bulgakov, Sergius, *Unfading Light*, 366.

subjected to analysis on different terms elsewhere.[923] To these Men devotes two whole books in the series *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life,* as well as substantial sections of the remaining books. That these discussions are presented alongside accounts of Old Testament history suggests a close relation between his biblical theology and views on comparative religion. His lectures on *World Spiritual Culture* and a number of articles including his *Concerning the Problematic of the "Axial Period"* also consider the matter in detail.[924] The latter article builds on the idea of Karl Jaspers that all the basic categories in which we think, right up to the present, were set down at the foundations of the different world religions during the period from around 800 BCE to 200 BCE. Men himself extends this period to incorporate the life and ministry of Christ and gives a rather more positive assessment of the 'second axial period' from 1500-1800 than Jaspers,[925] but the implication of this statement is that even the Marxism of the Soviet Union, the arch-enemy of the Church of his time, is simply a conditional reality of this type, derived from 'axial' thought. This may be seen in Men's account of Democritus, where he compares the materialism of the Greek thinker with contemporary Marxist materialism.

> The pathos of modern materialism, its irrational subtext, is its incontrovertible atheism, the negation of all superhuman powers. Ancient materialism rested on ancient pagan beliefs. This materialism presented itself as a philosophical version of Homeric religion with its idea of Fate and corporeal gods. On the other hand, the teaching of Democritus was the product of the decay of nature-philosophy, a sign of its deep crisis, which, in short, Greek thought soon overcame. While Democritus was teaching, Socrates had already appeared in Athens, and forced people to see themselves and the world differently. As a result, Plato did not once mention Democritus in his books. Materialism had to retreat into the shadows and await its hour, in order to announce itself once more at the next critical moment.[926]

In reading this, questions about Men's own Soviet context arise immediately. First of all, the extent to which he really believed that modern materialism denied all superhuman powers

[923] Lukasevicius, Arturas, *Aleksandr Men's Approach to the World's Religions.*
[924] Мень А.прот. Трудный путь к диалогу. 192-227.
[925] Мень А.прот. Трудный путь к диалогу. 197-198.
[926] Мень А.прот. Дионис, Логос, Судьба. 165-6.

may be doubted, especially considering his critique of the cult of Stalin, which is rooted in the human demand for faith, mystery and authority.[927] Since his analysis of human nature forced Men to deny the sustainability of 'incontrovertible atheism', modern materialism must in fact be a closer relative to the teaching of Democritus than he makes immediately apparent. Second, Men believed that the way in which Socratic thought overcame the materialism of Democritus could serve as a model for how a creative re-engagement with the Christian faith, through the teaching of the 'Russian school' could overcome contemporary materialism. Materialism has no power and must, out of necessity, be surpassed by a philosophical teaching that does genuinely account for the reality of human nature. This, for Men, is the divine-human narrative of Scripture. Thus, as in Trubetskoi's work, the thought of antiquity becomes a mirror held up to the thought of the present.

The fundamental significance of these ideas may be found in the fact that Men does not draw a hard boundary between what is 'Christian' and what is 'Marxist', as a number of Russian Orthodox thinkers have done.[928] Men sees Soviet 'atheist' culture as a conditional reality awaiting transformation. It arose as a response to the deep crisis of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Russia, one part of which involved a disconnection between the Church and broader society.[929] The divine-human narrative of Scripture, when realised in society through encounter with the Person of Jesus Christ, does not demand a return from the Soviet Union to the Middle Ages or exile into monastic seclusion, which only further enhances this disconnection, but engagement with the world. This world, "subjected to futility",[930] awaits its realisation through Christ-centred engagement. Even in the Soviet Union, any distinction between the 'sacred' and 'secular' is therefore exposed as pure relativity, which will be

[927] Мень А.прот. Трудный путь к диалогу. 102-107.
[928] One example is provided by Christians who wished for a return to Medieval consciousness, rejecting 'earthly' values (Мень А.прот. Трудный путь к диалогу. 59).
[929] Merezhkovskii's meetings between sacred and secular representatives (1901-3) sought to address this: Мень А.прот. Встреча.
[930] Romans 8:20.

overcome only by encounter with the Person of Christ.

Soviet Russia is not the only society where secular ideology has set itself in opposition to the Church. Wherever the effects of the Fall may be felt these oppositions exist in some form. They can only be overcome by the divine-human revelation at the centre of the biblical narrative, which exposes the relativity of these oppositions. This divine-human revelation has a universalising ecclesial character that builds on the freedom of human expression in the life of the Church and the world. Trubetskoi's christology, developed in response to Harnack, provides theological content on which the foundations of culture may be set. The Bible, as Holy Scripture, the revelation of Christ, the divine-humanity, is the central text for reflection on the development of human culture in any context, because of the transformative power of Christ at its centre.

Chapter Four showed that artistic interpretations of the divine-human narrative of Scripture provided one of the forms of this Christ-centred engagement with the world. Men's own charitable works in orphanages and homes for the elderly and people with special needs,[931] and lectures and articles on various figures who actively cared for the poor and mistreated, such as Mother Maria Skobtsova,[932] Sister Magdalen,[933] and the 'Fathers' of Latin America[934] who actively engaged in acts of charity, show another form of this Christ-centred engagement, which goes beyond confessional and political boundaries. Men recognised that the divine-human narrative of Scripture demanded care for the poor and those in need, and this may be seen with special clarity in the writings of prophets such as Amos and the ministry of Christ himself.[935] Yet another form of this engagement could plausibly be found in

[931] Мень А.прот. Любить Бога и любить человека: Домашние беседы. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2013, 197.
[932] Мень А.прот. Русская религиозная философия, 385-411.
[933] His article on Sister Magdalen (Bibliography 1.2.63) was reworked into part 3 of 'Witnesses' (Свидетели): Мень А.прот. Трудный путь к диалогу. 335-338.
[934] Мень А.прот. Трудный путь к диалогу. 228-244.
[935] Мень А.прот. Вестники..., 60-72 and his article 'On the Biblical Prophets': Мень А.прот. О библейских

the political and social reflections of the various articles that make up *A Hard Path to Dialogue.* A particularly clear example is his article *Democracy and the Crowd* (Bibliography 1.2.60), which builds on biblical anthropology and the Book of Revelation to contrast democracy and demagoguery. In summary, the connection between Men's biblical interpretation and his social and political commentary may be a valid extension of the current study that illuminates other areas of his work and ministry. All of these areas of Men's work established bridges with the secular culture of the Soviet Union in order to transform it; they did not reject it.

This emphasis on engagement suggests considerable commonality with the Christian humanism of all ages, and fits well with the critique of monasticism mentioned above, which the reader may find at times in the works of both Men and Trubetskoi. Men, indeed, claimed that the 'Russian school' authors, alongside various figures of the West, such as Bergson, Barth, Tillich and Teilhard, attempted to return to the kind of 'old' Christian humanism espoused by Erasmus of Rotterdam and others.[936] Involved in this was commitment to engagement with culture and society, including scientific investigation of all kinds. Men does not refer to it, but Eastern Christianity has its own 'humanist' tradition represented by such figures as Michael Psellos and Nicholas Cabasilas:[937] the first sought common points of orientation between Christianity, Greek philosophy and science; the second attempted an integration of Palamism with a social consciousness. Therefore there is no reason why the humanism of either Men or the 'Russian school' should necessarily be seen as a Western import. It merely shows a general methodology that has shown itself at certain times and in certain places in church history. For the same reason the universalising approach adopted by

пророках – Христианос III. 1994, 89-118.

[936] Мень А.прот. Трудный путь к диалогу. 315-6.

[937] 'Michael Psellus' in *Encyclopaedia Britannica,* 2019, https://www.britannica.com/biography/Michael-Constantine-Psellus and 'Nicholas Cabasilas' in *Encyclopaedia Britannica,* 2015, https://www.britannica.com/biography/Nicholas-Cabasilas.

Men has relevance for the divisions not only in Russian, but Western culture too.

Men's emphasis on the complementarity of the divine-human narrative of Scripture and the divine-human sacrament of the Eucharist seem to come from a distinctly Orthodox atmosphere, however, and sets its greatest challenges precisely in that context. Sacrament, Word and Image stand in mutual relationship with each other in his biblical thought. For Men, the central truth of Scripture and the reality in which believers partake at the Eucharist are to be identified. As discussed in 2.2.3, the Eucharist and participation in it therefore are a key factor in biblical interpretation. Eucharistic ecclesiality becomes a deposit for or reflection of divine-human culture, which is to be fully realised as the millennial kingdom. This divine-human culture is not to be straightforwardly identified with Orthodox culture as it shows itself in the present, but rather understood as something to be realised eschatologically. The 'Orthodox' culture of the present, in sharply distinguishing itself from the culture of the Soviet Union, risks becoming a mere facile renaming of certain structures and spiritualities. This is a retreat from the divine-humanity to the realm of relativity and conditionality and presents the believer with the temptation of avoiding engagement. Men's biblical thought and later articles on social and political questions in *A Hard Path to Dialogue* therefore assail the narrative of 'resurgent Orthodoxy' in post-Soviet Russia with a certain degree of virulence. Men clearly believed that Orthodoxy could only find its true divine-human identity through engagement with culture, and that engagement with culture must itself be driven by encounter with the Person of Christ, about whom we know from reading the Bible.

Many of these approaches and ideas find parallels in the work of Sergei Trubetskoi, discussed in Chapter Three. The centrality of the Person of Christ and the role of the ecclesial

community in transforming the 'metaphysics' of Greece and the 'mysticism' of Eastern religions into a living divine-human reality are important themes for both Men and Trubetskoi. Trubetskoi's engagement with Harnack and ensuing critical re-appropriation of Solov′evian thought provides a model for understanding Men's biblical theology. That Men takes a Prince and Rector of Moscow University as one of his most significant ideological sources, rather than an ecclesiastical figure like Metropolitan Filaret (Drozdov), or a historical monastic like Palamas, is significant in itself. In this he not only introduces his readers to a largely forgotten, but significant biblical scholar and philosopher, but charts new territory in reconciling sacred and secular spheres, both significant contributions to theology.

Men did not leave a systematic account of how to approach the matter of biblical interpretation, although, as this study shows, his hermeneutical principles can to a great extent be reconstructed from his 'religious histories', articles and other major works. An assessment alongside the thought of Sergei Trubetskoi allowed us to reconstruct a systematic account of Men's approach to biblical interpretation and the tradition of Orthodox biblical theology in which he stands. Yet in giving this kind of systematised account, we resolved what Men perhaps intentionally left unresolved. Despite the validity and even necessity of our endeavour, something of the vitality of the person described has been lost. This is where the personal biographical accounts written by Men's 'spiritual children' are irreplaceable, admirably complementing theological studies such as this. As we read in these biographical accounts, Men wanted his readers to ask their own questions and saw his own role as a facilitator rather than a theorist. For this reason, Men's characterisation of Socrates as a questioner and facilitator in *Dionysus, Logos, Fate,* deserves further study in the light of his pastoral and apologetic practice.[938]

[938] Мень А.прот. Дионис, Логос, Судьба. 191-4.

Chapter Three, in using Sergei Trubetskoi's writings as a way of approaching Men's biblical thought, introduces Trubetskoi's theology and philosophy. A serious study of this is long overdue, as are translations of his key works into English, but he is far from alone among 'Russian school' figures in this respect. Men's works, especially his enormous *Dictionary* indicate much further potential for research. Although such 'Russian school' figures as Sergius Bulgakov, Nikolai Berdyaev, Vladimir Solov′ev and Pavel Florensky have found those willing to research the philosophical and theological intricacies of their life and works, relatively little has been done on their approaches to biblical interpretation.[939] In this respect Men was a pioneer. Other figures – Sergei Trubetskoi, but also Mikhail Tareev, Anton Kartashev and the more recent Sergei Averintsev – may turn out to be no less interesting. The history and principles of biblical interpretation in the Russian Orthodox Church have not been studied at length, with many modern Orthodox theologians agreed that the contribution of the Eastern Orthodox Churches in this area could be far greater.[940] When the Orthodox Churches reassess this tradition from within, they will find that Men's books and articles not only provide a blueprint for further study, but that 'Russian school' philosophy and theology provide an unparalleled resource for the ongoing development of Orthodox biblical interpretation. Thus Orthodox biblical interpretation, in the same manner as Orthodox spirituality and Orthodox Patristic commentary, has the potential to enlighten and challenge far beyond the confessional boundaries of Orthodoxy itself.

[939] Negrov, Alexander, 'Fr. Sergius Bulgakov (1871-1944)...' and Негров А.И. Вопросы библейской герменевтики в творчестве П.А. Флоренского – ред. Порус В.Н. Философско-богословское наследие П.А. Флоренского и современность: На пути к синтетическому единству европейской культуры. М.: Библейско-богословский институт св. апостола Андрея, 2006. 25-39.

[940] At the conference *Unfading Light,* Wolfson College, Oxford, 7-8th March 2019, following a talk by Kallistos Ware on 'The Nature of Theology in G. Florovsky and V. Lossky' a discussion showed consensus that the contribution of Orthodox thought to Biblical Studies could be greater.

Bibliography 1: The Works of Aleksandr Men

'Works' have been presented first in Russian, then in English translation (brackets) in 1.1-8 of this bibliography. 'Works' are defined merely as bodies of material designed by Aleksandr Men for some form of unified presentation (see Chapter 1.2 in main study) and do not exactly correspond with what is available in print or online. Translations of the titles of these 'works' are intended to improve clarity of themes considered by Men for an English speaking reader. Each entry is followed by a list of key dates indicating when a 'work' was written, edited and published up to Men's death in 1990, then a list of 'related works' by Men. Most entries are then followed by a mini-bibliography indicating the different editions of each work and where the reader may gain access to a published copy of the 'work' in question. These mini-bibliographies only contain editions in Russian and English and do not contain references to internet resources, which are often many in number, so they are not 'complete' as such, even though they do aim to be fairly comprehensive. If no mini-bibliography is given for a particular work then this may be taken as an indication that it is only available online on the sites of *Fond Aleksandra Menya,* Yakov Krotov or in some cases in video format on Youtube.[941] Bibliography 1.9 lists only those published materials used during preparation of the study and, in contrast, it does reference online resources where they have been used. The list in Bibliography 1.9 contains cross-references to materials listed in 1.1-8 in order to help understand how these published materials relate to 'works'.

It should be clear that this bibliography does not pretend at completion. It is merely an attempt to present and understand the resources that are at this point readily available in print and online. No archival work has been undertaken in its compilation. Such work may give a

[941] The most significant internet resources for Aleksandr Men are the Russian language websites of the Alexander Men Foundation www.alexandermen.ru and Yakov Krotov http://yakov.works/2/persons/13_m/Myen.htm

yet clearer picture of Men's 'works' at a later date.

Journals with abbreviated titles

ЖМП – Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate

Вестник РХД – Journal of the Russian Christian Movement in Paris.

SDO - Die Stimme der Orthodoxie

Вестник РСХД – Journal of the Russian Student Christian Movement in Paris.

1.1) Books

Religious Histories

1.1.1) *Сын человеческий* (*Son of Man*)[942] under pseudonym A. Bogolyubov until 1976. Key dates: (i) 1958 - written and samizdat circulation; (ii) 1959 - edited and samizdat circulation – 2 vols.; (iii) 1959-1963 - chapters published in *ЖМП* (see related works below); (iv) 1965 - edited; (v) 1968 - published by La Vie Avec Dieu; (vi) 1969 - reprinted by La Vie Avec Dieu; (vii) 1976 - republished by La Vie Avec Dieu; (viii) 1983 - edited and republished by La Vie Avec Dieu; (ix) 1990 - edited and republished in *Смена*. Related works: (I) unpublished *О Христе* (*About Christ*) dated 1950; (ii) *ЖМП* journal articles from 1959-1963 *Nazareth, The Cross, "See, I am with you", Tabor and Golgotha, Victory over Death, Luminaries of Early Christianity, Salvation for the World, "My Lord and My God", Son of Thunder* and *The Mystery of the Magi*; (iii) Foreword from 1990: *From the Author: About the Book "Son of Man"*

a) Христос: юношеский вариант книги «О Христе» - машинопись, 1950.

b) Сын Человеческий: черновой вариант, первая редакция – Самиздат. Машинопись, 1958.

c) Сын Человеческий: книга I, вторая редакция – Самиздат. Машинопись, 1959.

d) Сын Человеческий: книга II, вторая редакция – Самиздат. Машинопись, 1959.

e) (Боголюбов А.) Сын человеческий. (первое изд.) Брюссель: La Vie avec Dieu, 1968.

f) (Боголюбов А.) Сын человеческий. (первое изд.) Брюссель: La Vie avec Dieu, 1969.

g) (Боголюбов А.) Сын человеческий. (второе изд.) Брюссель: La Vie avec Dieu, 1976.

h) Сын человеческий. (третье изд.) Брюссель: La Vie avec Dieu, 1983.

[942] See Книга протоиерея Александра Меня «Сын Человеческий». Сергиев Посад: Дубрава, 2015, 17-21: https://radubrava.ru/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/son-of-man.pdf [Accessed 20/04/2018]., p. 3.

i) Сын человеческий – Смена 1990. №6, 225-247; №7, 228-257; №8, 86-117; №9, 152-179; №10, 226-259; №11, 146-181; №12, 76-111.

j) Сын человеческий. (четвертое изд.) М.: Вита, 1991.

k) Сын человеческий. М.: Правда, 1991.

l) Сын человеческий. Саратов: Волга №7, 1991.

m) (Боголюбов А.) Сын человеческий. М.: P.S., 1991.

n) История религии. В поисках Пути, Истины и Жизни Том 7: Сын человеческий. М.: Слово, 1992.

o) Сын человеческий. М.: Протестант, 1992.

p) Сын человеческий. (четвертое изд.) М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1997.

q) *Son of Man*, trans. Samuel Brown, (Crestwood NY: SVS Press, 1998).

r) Сын человеческий. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2000.

s) Сын человеческий. (пятое изд.) М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008.

t) Сын человеческий. (шестое изд.) М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2013.

u) Сын человеческий. (седьмое изд.) М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2014.

v) Сын человеческий. - Собрание сочинений том 1. М.: Издательство Московской Париархии, 2015.

w) Сын человеческий. (седьмое изд.) М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2016.

1.1.2) *История религии. В поисках Пути, Истины и Жизни* (*In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life*) under pseudonym E. Svetlov until 1983. Key dates: see the six volumes listed individually below. Related works: (i) unpublished *О чем говорит и чему учит Библия* (*What the Bible speaks about and what it teaches*) dated 1957;[943] (ii) unpublished *kandidat* thesis *Элементы монотеизма в дохристианской религии и философии* (*The Elements of Monotheism in pre-Christian Religions and Philosophies*), 1967-1969. (iii) The six volumes listed below are related to each other, but not to *Son of Man.*

[943] Масленикова З.А. Жизнь отца Александра Меня. М.: Русслит, 1995.139: http://krotov.info/library/13_m/as/lennikova_1b.htm, [Accessed 07/07/2018].

a) О чем говорит и чему учит Библия. черновой вариант – Самиздат. Машинопись, 1957.

b) Элементы монотеизма в дохристианской религии и философии – Кандидат, Московская Духовная Академия, 1969.

c) История религии: В поисках Пути, Истины и Жизни. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1994. (excerpts)

1.1.2.1) *Истоки религии: Природы веры. Человек во Вселенной. Перед лицом Сущего* (*The Wellsprings of Religion: The Nature of Faith, Humanity in the Universe, Before the Face of Existence*). Key dates: (i) 1960 - written and samizdat circulation;[944] (ii) 1965 - reorganized;[945] (iii) 1970 - published by La Vie Avec Dieu; (iv) 1981 - republished by La Vie Avec Dieu; (v) 1990 - Second Chapter published in *Наука и жизнь*.

a) Истоки религии. Первая редакция – Самиздат. Машинопись, 1960.

b) Истоки религии. Вторая редакция – Самиздат. Машинопись, 1965.

c) (Светлов Э.) Истоки религии: Природы веры. Человек во Вселенной. Перед лицом Сущего. (первое изд.) Брюссель: La Vie avec Dieu, 1970.

d) (Светлов Э.) Истоки религии: Природы веры. Человек во Вселенной. Перед лицом Сущего. (второе изд.) Брюссель: La Vie avec Dieu, 1981.

e) Познание мира – Наука и жизнь. 1990, №4, 50-56. (Chapter Two only)

f) О Тейаре де Шардене – Вопросы философии. 1990, №12, 89-102. (Appendix Ten only)

g) История религии. В поисках Пути, Истины и Жизни Том 1: Истоки религии. М.: Слово, 1991.

h) Магия, Оккультизм, Христианство. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1996, 12-20, 76-83, 110-117. (excerpts)

i) *Christianity for the Twenty-First Century: The Prophetic Writings of Alexander Men,* ed.

[944] Масленикова, 199.
[945] On the advice of Sergei Zheludkov, see Масленикова, 219.

Roberts, Elizabeth and Ann Shukman, (New York: Continuum, 1996), 39-67. (excerpts)

j) Истоки религии: Природы веры. Человек во Вселенной. Перед лицом Сущего. (второе изд.) М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2000.

k) Истоки религии, Магизм и единобожие. М.: Эксмо, 2004.

l) Истоки религии: Природы веры. Человек во Вселенной. Перед лицом Сущего. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011.

m) Истоки религии. - Собрание сочинений том 2. М.: Издательство Московской Париархии, 2015.

n) *The Wellsprings of Religion,* trans. Alasdair MacNaughton (New York: SVS Press, 2017).

1.1.2.2) *Магизм и Единобожие: Религиозный путь человечества до эпохи великих Учителей* (Magic Art and Monotheism*: The Religious Path of Humanity Before the Epoch of the Great Teachers*). Key dates: (i) 1961-1965 - written and samizdat circulation;[946] (ii) 1968 - edited; (iii) 1971 - published by La Vie Avec Dieu; (iv) 1986 - republished by La Vie Avec Dieu; (v) 1990 - Third Chapter published in *Наука и жизнь.*

a) Магизм и единобожие. Первая редакция – Самиздат. Машинопись, 1965.

b) Магизм и единобожие. Вторая редакция – Самиздат. Машинопись, 1968.

c) (Светлов Э.) Магизм и Единобожие: Религиозный путь человечества до эпохи великих Учителей (первое изд.) Брюссель: La Vie avec Dieu, 1971.

d) (Светлов Э.) Магизм и Единобожие: Религиозный путь человечества до эпохи великих Учителей. (второе изд.) Брюссель: La Vie avec Dieu, 1986.

e) Доисторические мистики – Наука и жизнь. 1990, №2, 85-91. (Chapter Three only)

f) Борьба за веру, пророк и царь – Наука и жизнь. 1990, №12, 59-64. (Chapter Twenty-four only)

g) История религии. В поисках Пути, Истины и Жизни Том 2: Магизм и единобожие. М.:

[946] Масленикова, 199, 219.

Слово, 1991.

h) Магия, Оккультизм, Христианство. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1996, 21-68, 105-109. (excerpts)

i) Магизм и Единобожие: Религиозный путь человечества до эпохи великих Учителей. (второе изд.) М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2001.

j) Истоки религии, Магизм и единобожие. М.: Эксмо, 2004.

k) Магизм и Единобожие: Религиозный путь человечества до эпохи великих Учителей. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009.

l) Магизм и Единобожие - Собрание сочинений том 3. М.: Издательство Московской Париархии, 2016.

1.1.2.3) *У Врат Молчания: Духовная жизнь Китая и Индии в середине первого тысячелетия до нашей эры* (*At the Gates of Silence: The Spiritual Life of China and India in the middle of the first millenium BCE*). Key dates: (i) 1962-1964 - written and samizdat circulation;[947] (ii) 1968 - edited; (iii) 1971 - published by La Vie Avec Dieu; (iv) 1986 - republished by La Vie Avec Dieu.

a) У врат молчания. Первая редакция – Самиздат. Машинопись, 1964.

b) У врат молчания. Вторая редакция – Самиздат. Машинопись, 1968.

c) (Светлов Э.) У Врат Молчания: Духовная жизнь Китая и Индии в середине первого тысячелетия до нашей эры (первое изд.) Брюссель: La Vie avec Dieu, 1971.

d) (Светлов Э.) У Врат Молчания: Духовная жизнь Китая и Индии в середине первого тысячелетия до нашей эры. (второе изд.) Брюссель: La Vie avec Dieu, 1986.

e) История религии. В поисках Пути, Истины и Жизни Том 3: У врат молчания. М.: Слово, 1992.

[947] Completed immediately after a KGB search in 1964. See Масленикова.,199 and Daniel, Wallace, *Russia's Uncommon Prophet: Father Aleksandr Men and His Times* (DeKalb: NIU Press, 2016), 105-107 for the details of this incident.

f) Магия, Оккультизм, Христианство. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1996, 129-148. (excerpt from Appendix)

g) У Врат Молчания: Духовная жизнь Китая и Индии в середине первого тысячелетия до нашей эры (второе изд.) М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002.

h) У Врат Молчания, Дионис, Логос, Судьба. М.: Эксмо, 2005.

i) У Врат Молчания: Духовная жизнь Китая и Индии в середине первого тысячелетия до нашей эры. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009.

j) У врат молчания. - Собрание сочинений том 4. М.: Издательство Московской Париархии, 2016.

1.1.2.4) *Дионис, Логос, Судьба: Греческая религия и философия от эпохи колонизации до Александра* (Dionysus, Logos, Fate: *Greek Religion and Philosophy from the Epoch of Colonization to Alexander*). Key dates: (I) 1966 - written and samizdat circulation;[948] (ii) 1968 - edited; (iii) 1972 - published by La Vie Avec Dieu.

a) Дионис, Логос, Судьба. Первая редакция – Самиздат. Машинопись, 1966.

b) Дионис, Логос, Судьба. Вторая редакция – Самиздат. Машинопись, 1968.

c) (Светлов Э.) Дионис, Логос, Судьба: Греческая религия и философия от эпохи колонизации до Александра. Брюссель: La Vie avec Dieu, 1972.

d) История религии. В поисках Пути, Истины и Жизни Том 4: Дионис, Логос, Судьба. М.: Слово, 1992.

e) Дионис, Логос, Судьба: Греческая религия и философия от эпохи колонизации до Александра. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002.

f) У Врат Молчания, Дионис, Логос, Судьба. М.: Эксмо, 2005.

g) Дионис, Логос, Судьба: Греческая религия и философия от эпохи колонизации до Александра. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009.

[948] Daniel, Wallace, *Russia's Uncommon Prophet*, 219.

h) Дионис, Логос, Судьба – Собрание сочинений том 5. М.: Издательство Московской Париархии, 2017.

1.1.2.5) *Вестники Царства Божия: Библейские пророки от Амоса до Реставрации (VIII-IV вв. до н. э.)* (*Messengers of the Kingdom of God: The Biblical Prophets from Amos to the Restoration (8th to 4th centuries BCE)*). Key dates: (I) 1968 - writing initiated;[949] (ii) 1972 published by La Vie Avec Dieu; (iii) 1986 - republished by La Vie Avec Dieu.

a) (Светлов Э.) Вестники Царства Божия: Библейские пророки от Амоса до Реставрации (VIII-IV вв. до н. э.) (первое изд.) Брюссель: La Vie avec Dieu, 1972.
b) (Светлов Э.) Вестники Царства Божия: Библейские пророки от Амоса до Реставрации (VIII-IV вв. до н. э.) (второе изд.) Брюссель: La Vie avec Dieu, 1986.
c) История религии. В поисках Пути, Истины и Жизни Том 5: Вестники Царства Божия. М.: Слово, 1992.
d) Вестники Царства Божия: Библейские пророки от Амоса до Реставрации (VIII-IV вв. до н. э.) М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002.
e) Вестники Царства Божия, На пороге Нового Завета. М.: Эксмо, 2004.
f) Вестники Царства Божия: Библейские пророки от Амоса до Реставрации (VIII-IV вв. до н. э.) М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2010.
g) Вестники Царства Божия – Собрание сочинений том 6. М.: Издательство Московской Париархии, 2017.

1.1.2.6) *На пороге Нового Завета: От эпохи Александра Македонского до проповеди Иоанна Крестителя* (*On the Threshold of the New Covenant:*[950] *From the Epoch of Alexander of Macedonia to the Preaching of John the Baptist*). Key dates: (i) c. 1979 -

[949] Daniel, Wallace, *Russia's Uncommon Prophet*, 219.
[950] The Russian завет may be translated 'covenant' or 'testament'. In this case 'covenant' has been preferred as the content of the book suggests Men is referring to the realisation of Jeremiah 31:31-34 in the person of Christ, rather than the construction of the New Testament canon.

writing completed;[951] (ii) 07/05/1981 - editing completed;[952] (iii) 1983 - published by La Vie Avec Dieu; (iv) 1990 - excerpts published in *Знание-Сила*.

a) (Светлов Э.) На пороге Нового Завета: От эпохи Александра Македонского до проповеди Иоанна Крестителя. Брюссель: La Vie avec Dieu, 1983.

b) Из «На пороге Нового Завета» – Знание-Сила 1990, №6, 78-84; №7, 77-84; №8, 72-80.

c) История религии. В поисках Пути, Истины и Жизни Том 6: На пороге Нового Завета. М.: Слово, 1993.

d) На пороге Нового Завета: От эпохи Александра Македонского до проповеди Иоанна Крестителя. Книга I. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2003.

e) На пороге Нового Завета: От эпохи Александра Македонского до проповеди Иоанна Крестителя. Книга II. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2003.

f) Вестники Царства Божия, На пороге Нового Завета. М.: Эксмо, 2004.

g) На пороге Нового Завета: От эпохи Александра Македонского до проповеди Иоанна Крестителя. Книга I. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2010.

h) На пороге Нового Завета: От эпохи Александра Македонского до проповеди Иоанна Крестителя. Книга II. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2010.

i) На пороге Нового Завета – Собрание сочинений том 7. М.: Издательство Московской Париархии, 2018.

1.1.3) *Первые апостолы* (*The First Apostles*), incomplete and unpublished. Key dates: (i) 1979-1980 - partially written as manuscript.[953]

a) Первые апостолы. (первое изд.) М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1998.

[951] Еремин. А.А. Отец Александр Мень. Пастырь на рубеже веков. М.: «Carte Blanche», 2001., 448.
[952] Масленикова, 467-8, 480.
[953] Men worked on it between his completion of *On the Threshold* and his initiation of work on *Dictionary of Biblical Studies*, Мень А. прот. Первые апостолы. (второе изд.) М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. 7-8. Maslenikova's diary entry for 11th Dec. 1979 (458) tells us that Men has already planned it, created a bibliography and written the first page, and her entry for 15th Feb. 1980 (459) mentions ongoing work connected with it.

b) Первые апостолы. (второе изд.) М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009.

c) История религии: Исторические пути Христианства. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2015. (excerpts)

Жизнь в церкви *Life in the Church* Trilogy

1.1.4) *Таинство, слово, и образ. О православном богослужении* (*Sacrament, Word and Image: About the Orthodox Divine Service*). Key dates: (i) 1969 - published anonymously as *Nebo na zemle* (*Heaven on earth*); (ii) 1980 - published as *Sacrament, Word and Image* by La Vie avec Dieu.[954] Related works: (i) *How to Read the Bible*; (ii) *A Practical Guide to Prayer*;[955] (iii) *Symbol of Faith (besedy)*;[956] (iv) Correspondence between Ioann Shakhovskii[957] and Aleksandr Men (1979-1980); (v) *An Introduction to the Orthodox Service* (1.2.27).

a) Небо на земле: Богослужение Восточной Церкви (Литургический очерк). Брюссель: La Vie avec Dieu, 1969. (anonymous)

b) Таинство, слово, и образ. О православном богослужении. Брюссель: La Vie avec Dieu, 1980.

c) Таинство, слово, и образ. О православном богослужении. Ленинград: Ферро-Логас, 1991.

d) Таинство, слово, и образ. О православном богослужении. М.: Слово, 1991.

e) *Orthodox Worship: Sacrament, Word, Image,* trans. Colin Masica, (Crestwood NY: SVS Press, 1999).

e) Таинство, слово, и образ. О православном богослужении. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2001.

f) Таинство, слово, и образ. О православном богослужении. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2007.

[954] The first book to be published under Men's own name.

[955] According to *Interview in Case of Arrest* (1978), *Sacrament, Word and Image* was intended as the first part of a trilogy, provisionally titled *Жизнь в Церкви* (*Life in the Church)*. These two titles were intended as the second and third parts.

[956] Incorporated as the Sixth Chapter from the 1980 edition.

[957] Shakhovskii wrote the Foreword to the 1980 edition.

1.1.5) *Как читать Библию: Руководство к чтению книг Ветхого и Нового Завета* (*How to Read the Bible: A Guide to Reading the Books of the Old and New Testaments*). Key dates: (i) 1976 - circulated in samizdat; (ii) 1980 - confiscated from parishioners' homes during KGB searches;[958] (iii) 1981 - published by La Vie avec Dieu (1 vol); (iv) 1988 - Men added some Biblical passages and *Mir biblii (The World of the Bible)* as an introduction in draft.[959] Related works: (I) *Sacrament, Word and Image;* (ii) *A Practical Guide to Prayer;*[960] (iii) *The Bible;* (iv) *The World of the Bible;* (v) commentaries for *The Brussels Bible.*

a) Как читать Библию: Руководство к чтению книг Ветхого и Нового Завета – Самиздат. Машинопись, 1976.
b) Как читать Библию: Руководство к чтению книг Ветхого и Нового Завета. Брюссель: La Vie avec Dieu, 1981.
c) Как читать Библию: Руководство к чтению книг Ветхого и Нового Завета. Брюссель: La Vie avec Dieu, 1991.
d) Как читать Библию: Руководство к чтению книг Ветхого и Нового Завета. Часть первая. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1997.
e) Как читать Библию: Руководство к чтению книг Ветхого и Нового Завета. Часть вторая. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1998.
f) Как читать Библию: Руководство к чтению книг Ветхого и Нового Завета. Часть третья. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1998.
g) Как читать Библию: Руководство к чтению книг Ветхого и Нового Завета. Часть первая. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2005.
h) Как читать Библию: Руководство к чтению книг Ветхого и Нового Завета. Часть вторая.

[958] French, April Lynn, 'Spiritual Dissident: The Writings of Father Aleksandr Men as Dissent from Soviet Ideology'. MA thesis, Regent College, Vancouver, BC, 2011, 135.
[959] French, April Lynn, 'Spiritual Dissident: The Writings of Father Aleksandr Men', 136.
[960] According to *Interview in Case of Arrest* (1978), *How to Read the Bible* was intended as the second part of a trilogy, provisionally titled *Жизнь в Церкви* (*Life in the Church*). These two titles were intended as the first and third parts.

М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2005.

i) Как читать Библию: Руководство к чтению книг Ветхого и Нового Завета. Часть третья. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2005.

1.1.6) *Практическое руководство к молитве* (*A Practical Guide to Prayer*), unpublished in draft form with appendices. Key dates: (i) 1980 - section *Молитво и молитвословие* anonymously published as article *A Practical Guide to Prayer* in *Vestnik RkhD;* (ii) early 1980s? - five further sections added to the manuscript together with appendices. Related works: (I) *Sacrament, Word and Image;* (ii) *How to Read the Bible;*[961] (iii) article *A Practical Guide to Prayer;* (iv) interview *Five Questions to Father Aleksandr and His Answers* (1.3.30)*;* (v) Men's unpublished draft does not include the separate texts *About Keeping Lent, Handbook for the Orthodox Christian, About Keeping the Christmas Fast,* the lecture *On Prayer* or the *beseda An Inner Step* nor the miscellaneous excerpts from Men's sermons, lectures and prayers on the themes of repentance, thanksgiving and forgiveness known as *Да, исправится молитва моя* (Yes, My Prayer will be corrected...).

a) Практическое руководство к молитве - Вестник РХД (Париж) 1980, №131, 5-9.

b) Практическое руководство к молитве. (ред. Н. Большакова). Рига: ФиАМ, 1991.

c) Практическое руководство к молитве. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1995.

d) Практическое руководство к молитве. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1999.

e) Практическое руководство к молитве. (третье изд.) М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002.

f) Практическое руководство к молитве. (четвертое изд.) М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008.

g) *An Inner Step Toward God: Writings and Teachings on Prayer by Father Alexander Men,* trans. Christa Belyaeva, ed. April French (Brewster MA: Paraclete Press, 2014).

[961] According to *Interview in Case of Arrest* (1978), *A Practical Guide to Prayer* was intended as the third part of a trilogy, provisionally titled *Жизнь в Церкви* (*Life in the Church*). These two titles were intended as the first and second parts.

1.1.7) *Исагогика: Курс по изучению Священного Писания: Ветхий Завет* (*Isagogics, A Course for Studying the Holy Scriptures: Old Testament*), complete, but unpublished.[962] Key dates: (i) 1982 – completed and Introduction written;[963] (ii) 1983 – rejected for use as a teaching resource by Moscow Theological Academy.[964]

a) Исагогика: Курс по изучению Священного Писания: Ветхий Завет. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2000.
b) Исагогика: Курс по изучению Священного Писания: Ветхий Завет. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2003.
c) Исагогика – Собрание сочинений том 8. М.: Издательство Московской Париархии, 2019.

1.1.8) *Библиологический словарь* (*Dictionary of Biblical Studies*), 1790 articles substantially complete, but unpublished, authorship not disputed.[965] Key dates: (i) Early 1970s – idea for *Dictionary* developed from this period;[966] (ii) 1980-1985 – most active period of writing and researching;[967] (iii) 1985 – submitted and rejected for qualification of *doktor* at Leningrad

[962] Предеин Д.прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как выдающийся православный катехизатор и миссионер второй половины XX века. Одесса: "Астропринт", 2015, 45.
[963] Мень А.прот. Исагогика: Курс по изучению священного писания: Ветхий завет. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2003,14. 1982 is cited as the date of this work's completion by April French in her thesis (124).
[964] Предеин Д.прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как выдающийся православный катехизатор... 59.
[965] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый А-Й. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002, 7.
[966] Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый А-Й, 7.
[967] First, it is documented that he started work on it when he abandoned *The First Apostles*. See Мень А. прот. Первые Апостолы, 7-8. Second, Maslenikova's diary entry for 3rd November 1980 refers to a conversation with Men where he claimed that it was necessary to write more simplistically and with greater concision than he had done in his previous work, but without reducing the substantial content. This plausibly fits with the change in style between *In Search of the Way, the Truth and the Life, The First Apostles* and the *Dictionary of Biblical Studies*. See Масленикова, 467. Men was clearly still working on it in August 1985 as shown by the discussion of his work on articles about Lev Zhille and Sergei Bulgakov in a letter to Reitlinger.

Theological Academy;[968] (iv) Late 1980s? – circulation among parishioners in a seven volume format;[969] (v) July 1990 – work ongoing.[970] Related works: (i) interview *Why be a Christian?*

a) Послания апостола Павла – Мир Библии, 1994, №2, 39-73. (one article)

b) Послания апостола Петра – Мир Библии, 1995, №3, 40-43. (one article)

c) Библиологический словарь. Том первый А-Й. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002.

d) Библиологический словарь. Том второй К-П. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002.

e) Библиологический словарь. Том третий Р-Я. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002.

1.1.9) The extent of Men's authorship is unclear for the extensive anonymous commentaries included in *Библия (The Brussels Bible)*. Key dates:[971] (i) 1973 - initially publication by La Vie avec Dieu; (ii) 1983 – revised and republished by La Vie avec Dieu; (iii) 1987 - revised and republished by La Vie avec Dieu; (iv) 1989 – final revision and publication approved by Aleksandr Men.[972] Related works: (i) *How to Read the Bible.*

a) Библия. в Синодальном переводе с комментариями. Брюсседь: La Vie avec Dieu, 1973.

b) Библия. в Синодальном переводе с комментариями. Брюсседь: La Vie avec Dieu, 1983.

c) Библия. в Синодальном переводе с комментариями. Брюсседь: La Vie avec Dieu, 1987.

d) Библия. в Синодальном переводе с комментариями. Брюсседь: La Vie avec Dieu, 1989.

This is now a commonly available version of the Russian Bible that has been reprinted many times – for example the version used in the present study:

[968] Предеин Д.прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как выдающийся православный катехизатор... 59.
[969] Илюшенко В.И. Отец Александр Мень. Жизнь, смерть, бессмертие. М.: Эксмо книгоноша, 2013, 171.
[970] See interview of Men *Why be a Christian?* conducted by Mark Makarov: *Christianity for the Twenty-First Century,* 29-38.
[971] Колупаев В.Е. Брюссельское издательство <Жизнь с Богом>: Книжный мир Русского Зарубежья XX века Радиомиссия для советских слушателей. Saarbrücken: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing, 2012, 169.
[972] Андреев Г., Юдин А. Жизнь с Богом: Брюссель–Москва. М.: Культурно-просветительский центр «Духовная библиотека», 2013, 138.

e) Библия. Книги Священного Писания. Ветхого и Нового Завета в Синодальном переводе с комментариями и приложениями. М.: Российское Библейское общество, 2017.

1.1.10) The extent of Men's authorship is unclear[973] for the anonymous commentaries included in *Антология: Раннехристианские Отцы Церкви* (*Anthology: Early Christian Fathers of the Church*). Key dates: (I) 1978 - published by La Vie avec Dieu; (ii) 1988 – republished as *Антология: Ранние Отцы Церкви* (Anthology: Early Fathers of the Church).[974]

a) Антология: Раннехристианские Отцы Церкви. Брюссель: La Vie avec Dieu, 1978.

b) Антология: Ранние Отцы Церкви. Брюссель: La Vie avec Dieu, 1988.

Books for Children and Young People

1.1.11) *Свет и жизнь (Light and Life).*[975] Key dates: (i) 1972 – the first of the three sections *Откуда явилось всё это?* (*Where did all this come from?*) was published by Edizioni Dehoniane under pseudonym A. Pavlov; (ii) 1978 – work on the other two sections, *Свет миру* (*Light to the World*) and *Соль земли* (*Salt of the Earth*) is ongoing; (iii) 1990 – prepared for publication by Men and published by La Vie avec Dieu.[976] Related works: (i) *Interview in Case of Arrest.*

a) (Павлов А.) Откуда явилось всё это? Napoli: Edizioni Dehoniane, 1972.

[973] Еремин. А.А. Отец Александр Мень, 330.
[974] Колупаев В.Е. Брюссельское издательство «Жизнь с Богом», 171.
[975] The authorship of the three parts seems unclear on the basis of the introductory page in the 1990 edition, where it is claimed that Men was author of part of this work. Nonetheless, both Масленикова, 256 and Men in his 1978 *Interview in Case of Arrest* (Мень А. прот. О себе.... 211) appear to claim Men's authorship for all three substantial sections.
[976] This final publication of Men's work by La Vie avec Dieu was realised shortly after his death, but the edition was prepared by Men.

b) Свет и жизнь. Брюссель: La Vie avec Dieu, 1990.

c) Откуда явилось всё это? М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009.

d) Свет и жизнь. М.: Книжный мир экумени, 2012.

1.1.12) *Свет миру: Евангельская история, пересказанная для детей* (*Light to the World: The Story of the Gospel retold for Children*), completed, but unpublished and without illustrations. Key dates: unknown.

a) Свет миру (ред. Григоренко Н. Ф.) - Пионерская правда, 25/12/1990, №154, 4; 27/12/1990, №155, 4.

b) Свет миру: Евангельская история, пересказанная для детей. М.: Издание Сабашниковых, 1991.

c) Свет миру: Евангельская история, пересказанная для детей. (рис. А. Смирнов). М.: Малыш, 1992.

d) Свет миру: Евангельская история, пересказанная для детей. (рис. А. Смирнов). М.: Логос, 1999.

e) Свет миру: Евангельская история, пересказанная для детей. (рис. А. Смирнов). М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2003.

f) Свет миру: Евангельская история, пересказанная для детей. (рис. А. Смирнов). М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2014.

1.1.13) *Спаситель* (*Saviour*), completed, and with illustration chosen by Men,[977] but unpublished. Key dates: unknown.

a) Спаситель. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2005.

[977] Спаситель. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2005, 2.

Literary Works

1.1.14) *Сила и слава* is Alexander Men's Russian translation of Graham Greene's novel, *The Power and the Glory.* Key dates: (I) 1980-1981 – translation completed;[978] (ii) 1980s – Men circulated an audio tape of his translation among parishioners. Related works: (I) *Afterword* (1.2.74).

a) Грин Г. Сила и слава (пер. Мень А. прот.) М.: ВГБИЛ им. Рудомино, 2012.

1.1.15) Three chapters of an unfinished novel by Alexander Men, entitled *Власть и старость* (*Power and Old Age*), *Великий человек* (*A Great Person*), and *Миссия* (*Mission*). Key dates: (i) early 1980s - found in Alexander Men's personal archive by Z. Maslennikova, although written much earlier.[979]

a) Власть и старость, Великий человек, Миссия – Масленикова З.А. Жизнь отца Александра Меня. М.: Русслит, 1995, 555-582.

Autobiography

1.1.16) Unpublished memoirs, intended for use in a book,[980] some written and some recorded on cassette.[981] Key dates: (I) 1970s? – begins writing accounts and collating personal archive; (ii) 1979-1980 – materials collected by editor Zoya Maslennikova.

[978] Maslenikova refers to work on this translation in her diary entries for 27th October 1980 (467) and 28th February 1981 (473).
[979] The chapters are Appendix One in Масленикова, 555-582.
[980] Масленикова, 11.
[981] For example, his recollections of the 1960s are available in audio format at http://www.alexandermen.ru/books/bychkov/bych16.html [Accessed 01/05/18]. See also Мень А. прот. О себе.... 7-9.

a) Воспоминания – Масленикова З.А. Жизнь отца Александра Меня. М.: Русслит, 1995, 13-273.

b) Приложения 6-8 – Бычков С. С. Хроника нераскрытого убийства. М.: Русское рекламное издательствоб 1996.

c) «Люди, устремленные к своим целям, всегда достигают их» - Сегодня. 11/12/1993, №93, 14.

d) Веселая Тетрадка Александра Меня – Московский Комсомолец. 01/03/1995, 8.

e) О себе... М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2007.

f) О воспитании, о своем детстве и учителях – Радость служения. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2013, 164-199.

1.2) Articles

Articles first published in Russian-Soviet Theological Journals

1.2.1) *Назарет – колыбель христианства (Nazareth – the Cradle of Christianity).* Key dates: (i) 1959 – published in *ЖМП*. Related materials: (i) *Son of Man* (1.1.1).

a) Назарет – колыбель христианства – ЖМП, 1959, №9, 61-64.

b) Назарет – колыбель христианства – Навстречу Христу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, 31-41.

1.2.2) *Поэзия св. Григория Богослова (The Poetry of St. Gregory the Theologian).* Key dates: (i) 1959 – published in *ЖМП*.

a) Поэзия св. Григория Богослова – ЖМП, 1959, №3, 62-68.

b) Поэзия св. Григория Богослова – Навстречу Христу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, 7-30.

1.2.3) *В молитвах Неусыпающая (In Prayers Incessant).* Key dates: (i) 1960 – published in *ЖМП*.

a) В молитвах Неусыпающая – ЖМП, 1960, №8, 37-42.

b) В молитвах Неусыпающая – Навстречу Христу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, 69-82.

1.2.4) *Крест (The Cross).* Key dates: (i) 1960 – published in *ЖМП*. Related materials: (i) *Son of Man* (1.1.1).

a) Крест – ЖМП, 1960, №9, 36-38.

b) Крест – Навстречу Христу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, 83-90.

1.2.5) *На пороге нового года (On the Threshold of the New Year).* Key dates: (i) 1960 – published in *ЖМП*.

a) На пороге нового года – ЖМП, 1960, №1, 15-17.

b) На пороге нового года – Навстречу Христу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, 42-49.

1.2.6) *Святая святых (The Holy of Holies).* Key dates: (i) 1960 – published in *ЖМП*.

a) Святая святых – ЖМП, 1960, №11, 50-52.

b) Святая святых – Навстречу Христу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, 91-100.

1.2.7) *«Се Аз с вами»*[982] *("Look, I am with you").* Key dates: (i) 1960 – published in *ЖМП*. Related materials: (i) *Son of Man* (1.1.1).

a) «Се Аз с вами» – ЖМП, 1960, №7, 25-27.

b) «Се Аз с вами» – Навстречу Христу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, 50-57.

1.2.8) *Фавор и Голгофа (Tabor and Golgotha).* Key dates: (i) 1960 – published in *ЖМП*. Related materials: (i) *Son of Man* (1.1.1).

a) Фавор и Голгофа – ЖМП, 1960, №7, 27-32.

b) Фавор и Голгофа – Навстречу Христу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, 58-68.

[982] This is a citation of Mt. 28:20 in Church Slavonic.

1.2.9) *Навстречу Христу (Towards Christ)*. Key dates: (i) 1961 – published in *ЖМП*.

a) Навстречу Христу – ЖМП, 1961, №1, 45-47.

b) Навстречу Христу – Навстречу Христу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, 101-108.

1.2.10) *Победа над смертью (Victory over Death)*. Key dates: (i) 1961 – published in *ЖМП*. Related materials: (i) *Son of Man* (1.1.1).

a) Победа над смертью – ЖМП, 1961, №4, 44-47.

b) Победа над смертью – Навстречу Христу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, 122-134.

1.2.11) *Последние дни и мученическая кончина Иоанна Крестителя (The Final Days and Martyrdom of John the Baptist)*. Key dates: (i) 1961 – published in *ЖМП*. Related materials: (i) Letter to Patriarch Aleksii I.[983]

a) Последние дни и мученическая кончина Иоанна Крестителя – ЖМП, 1961, №11, 60-63.

1.2.12) *Пятидесятницу празднуем! (We celebrate Pentecost!)*. Key dates: (i) 1961 – published in *ЖМП*.

a) Пятидесятницу празднуем! – ЖМП, 1961, №5, 55-58.

b) Пятидесятницу празднуем! – Навстречу Христу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, 135-146.

1.2.13) *Светочи первохристианства (Luminaries of Early Christianity)*. Key dates: (i) 1961 – published in *ЖМП*. Related materials: (i) *Son of Man* (1.1.1).

[983] The letter defends an exegetical position taken in the article.

a) Светочи первохристианства – ЖМП, 1961, №7, 58-66.

b) Светочи первохристианства – Навстречу Христу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, 147-174.

1.2.14) *Спасение миру (Salvation for the World).* Key dates: (i) 1961 – published in *ЖМП*. Related materials: (i) *Son of Man* (1.1.1).

a) Спасение миру – ЖМП, 1961, №2, 45-49.

b) Спасение миру – Навстречу Христу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, 109-121.

1.2.15) *«Господь мой и Бог мой» ("My Lord and My God").* Key dates: (i) 1962 – published in *ЖМП*. Related materials: (i) *Son of Man* (1.1.1).

a) «Господь мой и Бог мой» – ЖМП, 1962, №5, 79-80.

b) «Господь мой и Бог мой» – Навстречу Христу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, 231-243.

1.2.17) *Расизм перед судом христианства (Racism before the Judgment of Christianity).* Key dates: (i) 1962 – published in *ЖМП*; (ii) 1963 – published in *SDO*.

a) Расизм перед судом христианства – ЖМП, 1962, №3, 22-27.

b) Rassismus und Christentum – SDO, 1963, 3.

c) Расизм перед судом христианства – Навстречу Христу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, 198-216.

1.2.18) *Сын громов: Очерк жизни и творений апостола Иоанна Богослова (Son of Thunder: A Sketch of the Life and Work of the Apostle John the Theologian).* Key dates: (i) 1962 – published in *ЖМП*. Related materials: (i) *Son of Man* (1.1.1).

a) Сын громов: Очерк жизни и творений апостола Иоанна Богослова – ЖМП, 1962, №5, 49-60.
b) Сын громов: Очерк жизни и творений апостола Иоанна Богослова – Навстречу Христу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, 244-279.

1.2.19) *Тайна волхвов (The Mystery of the Magi)*. Key dates: (i) 1962 – published in *ЖМП*. Related materials: (i) *Son of Man* (1.1.1).

a) Тайна волхвов – ЖМП, 1962, №1, 60-67.
b) Тайна волхвов – Навстречу Христу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, 175-197.

1.2.20) *Эрнест Райт. Библейская археология (Ernest Wright: Biblical Archaeology)*. Key dates: (i) 1962 – published in *ЖМП*.

a) Эрнест Райт. Библейская археология – ЖМП, 1962, №3, 77-79.
b) Эрнест Райт. Библейская археология – Навстречу Христу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, 217-230.

1.2.21) *Мы избираем жизнь, полную опасности* (We choose a life full of danger), a review of Dr. Albert J. Rasker, *Wir wählen das gefährliche Leben* (München: Kaiser, 1961). Key dates: (i) 1962 – published in *ЖМП*.

a) Мы избираем жизнь, полную опасности – ЖМП, 1962, №5, 79-80.
b) Мы избираем жизнь, полную опасности – Навстречу Христу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, 280-286.

1.2.21) *Святой апостол Лука как дееписатель церкви (The Apostle St. Luke as the Recorder (Mazkir)*[984] *of the Church)*. Key dates: (i) 1963 – published in *ЖМП*.

a) Святой апостол Лука как дееписатель церкви – ЖМП, 1963, №12, 50-52.

b) Святой апостол Лука как дееписатель церкви – Навстречу Христу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, 287-295.

1.2.22) *Святой Ливерий, папа Римский: К 1600-летию со дня преставления (St. Liberius, Pope of Rome: For the 1600th Anniversary of his Passing)*. Key dates: (i) 1966 – published in *ЖМП*.

a) Святой Ливерий, папа Римский: К 1600-летию со дня преставления – ЖМП, 1966, №8, 52-57.

b) Святой Ливерий, папа Римский: К 1600-летию со дня преставления – Навстречу Христу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, 296-308.

1.2.23) *К истории русской православной библеистики (Concerning the History of Russian Orthodox Biblical Studies)*. Key dates: (i) 1987 - published in *Bogoslovskie Trudy*.

a) К истории русской православной библеистики – Богословские труды, 1987, №28, 272-289.

b) К истории русской православной библеистики – Навстречу Христу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, 309-382.

[984] The Russian дееписатель is an archaic word used in the Synodal Bible (1876) to translate the Hebrew word *mazkir*, which appears to have been an official position in the courts of Ancient Israel. The *mazkir* was expected to record the events of the king's reign (2 Samuel 8:16, 1 Kings 4: 3, 2 Kings 18:18,37, Isaiah 36:3,22, 2 Chronicles 34:8).

1.2.24) *Несколько слов о деле двух московских священников (A few words about the affair of two Moscow priests),* under the pseudonym Arkadiev. Key dates: (i) 1970 - published in *Вестник РСХД.*

a) (Аркадьев) Несколько слов о деле двух московских священников – Вестник РСХД. I-II 1970 №95-96, 99-106.

1.2.25) *Gespräche mit dem Starzen Warsanofi von Optina (Conversations with the Elder Barsanuphius of Optina).* Key dates: (i) 1976 - published in *SDO*.

a) 'Gespräche mit dem Starzen Warsanofi von Optina', *Stimme der Orthodoxie,* Berlin, 1976, 5, 52-59.

1.2.26) *Die Starzen von Optina. Starez Makari, Schriftsteller und Mönch (The Elders of Optina: The Elder Macarius, Writer and Monk).* Key dates: (i) 1976 - published in *SDO*.

a) 'Die Starzen von Optina. Starez Makari, Schriftsteller und Mönch', *Stimme der Orthodoxie,* Berlin, 1976, 6, 60-64.

1.2.27) *Wladimir Solowjow – Werk und Erbe (Vladimir Solov'ev: Work and Legacy).* Key dates: (i) 1976 - published in *SDO*.

a) 'Wladimir Solowjow – Werk und Erbe', *Stimme der Orthodoxie,* Berlin, 1976, 2, 46-61.

1.2.28) *Einführung in den orthodoxen Gottesdienst (An Introduction to the Orthodox Service),* under the pseudonym A. Feogonostow. Key dates: (i) 1976 - published in *SDO*. Related works: (i) *Sacrament, Word and Image* (1.1.4).

a) (A. Feogonostow) 'Einführung in den orthodoxen Gottesdienst', *Stimme der Orthodoxie,* Berlin, 1976, 9, 43-64.

1.2.29) *Die Gemeinschaft von Qumran und das Christentum (The Qumran Community and Christianity)*. Key dates: (i) 1977 – published in *SDO.*

a) 'Die Gemeinschaft von Qumran und das Christentum', *Stimme der Orthodoxie,* Berlin, 1977, 8-9, 58-59.

1.2.30) *Erzbischof Lukas (Wojno-Jassenezki) zum 100. Geburtstag. (27.04.1877-11.06.1961) (100 years since the birth of Archbishop Lukas Voino-Yasenitskii (27/04/1877-11/06/1961)),* published anonymously. Key dates: (i) 1977 – published in *SDO*. Related works: (i) *Foreword to the Book by M. Popovskii* (1.2.55).

a) (anonymous) Erzbischof Lukas (Wojno-Jassenezki) zum 100. Geburtstag. (27.04.1877-11.06.1961), *Stimme der Orthodoxie,* Berlin, 1977, 10, 9-13.

1.2.31) *По поводу отклика на интервью: Ответ И. Шафаревичу (Concerning the Reaction to an Interview: A Response to I. Shafarevich)*. Key dates: (i) 1977 – published in *Вестник РСХД.*

a) По поводу отклика на интервью: Ответ И. Шафаревичу – Вестник РСХД. III.1977, №122,

89-91.

b) Приложение 12 – Бычков С. С. Хроника нераскрытого убийства. М.: Русское рекламное издательствоб 1996.

1.2.32) *Свет миру (Light to the World).* Key dates: (i) 1979 – published in *Logos.* Related works: (I) slide film *Light to the World;* (ii) It is distinct from the second part of 1.1.11 and 1.1.12.

a) Свет миру – Logos, Brussels, 1979, №35-36, 133-157.

1.2.33) *Практическое руководство к молитве (A Practical Guide to Prayer),* published anonymously. Key dates: (i) 1980 - published in *Вестник РХД.* Related works: (i) the book *A Practical Guide to Prayer* (1.1.6).

a) Практическое руководство к молитве - Вестник РХД (Париж) 1980, №131, 5-9.

1.2.34) *Введение в христианскую веру и жизнь. План к изучению «Символа веры» и основ Евангелия (An Introduction to the Christian Faith and Life. A Plan for studying the Creed and the basics of the Gospel).* Key dates: (i) 1984 – published in *Logos.*

a) Введение в христианскую веру и жизнь. План к изучению «Символа веры» и основ Евангелия – Logos, Brussels, 1984, №41-44, 166-191.
b) Введение в христианскую веру и жизнь. План к изучению «Символа веры» и основ Евангелия - «Смертию смерть поправ». Минск: Эридан, 1990.

1.2.35) *The Messianic Eschatology of St. Paul in Connexion with the Primitive Preaching of*

the Gospel. Key dates: (i) 1986 - published (in English) in a collection by Leuven University Press.

a) 'The Messianic Eschatology of St. Paul in Connexion with the Primitive Preaching of the Gospel', ed. A. Vanhoye, *L'apôtre Paul: Personnalité, Style et Conception du Ministère: Extrait,* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1986), 322-3 (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensum 73).
b) К вопросу о мессианской эсхатологии св. Павла в связи с первоначальной евангельской проповедью: Тезисы доклада - «Aequinox». Сборник памяти о. А. Меня. (ред. Вишневецкий И. Г., Рабинович Е. Г.) М.: "Carte Blanche". 1991, 207-210.

1.2.36) *Основные черты христианского мировоззрения по учению Слова Божия и опыту Церкви (Basic Characteristics of a Christian Worldview according to the Teaching of the Word of God and the Experience of the Church),* also known as *Кредо (Credo)*. Key dates: (i) 1979 – Men writes his *Credo* as a written response to a request from Maslenikova (includes scriptural references, but not headings in original form); (ii) 1989 - published in *Символ*; (iii) 1990 – prepared for inclusion in *Трудный путь к диалогу (A Hard Path to Dialogue)*.[985]

a) Основные черты христианского мировоззрения по учению Слова Божия и опыту Церкви – Символ (Париж), 1989, №21, 85-90.
b) Кредо - «Смертию смерть поправ». Минск: Эридан, 1990.
c) Кредо – Русская мысль 13/09/1991 (3895), приложение, III.
d) Основные черты христианского мировоззрения по учению Слова Божия и опыту Церкви - Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 26-30.

[985] This collection was prepared for publication by Alexander Men himself, before his death. See Предеин Д., прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как выдающийся православный катехизатор..., 45.

e) Основные черты христианского мировоззрения по учению Слова Божия и опыту Церкви - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Радуга, 1992.

f) Кредо – Масленикова З. А. Жизнь отца Александра Меня. М.: Русслит, 1995, 443-447.

g) 'A Credo for Today's Christian', *Christianity for the Twenty-First Century: The Prophetic Writings of Alexander Men,* ed. Roberts, Elizabeth and Ann Shukman, (New York: Continuum, 1996), 68-74.

h) Основные черты христианского мировоззрения по учению Слова Божия и опыту Церкви - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1999.

i) Кредо. Основные жизненные прицины Христианства - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 362-367.

Articles first published in Soviet Journals and Newspapers

1.2.37) *«Не сводить старые счеты, а начать свободный диалог...»* ("Do not settle old scores, but start a new dialogue..."). Key dates: (i) 1988 - published in *Горизонт*.

a) «Не сводить старые счеты, а начать свободный диалог...» - Горизонт 1988, №10, 51-55.

b) «Не сводить старые счеты, а начать свободный диалог...» - Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 49-54.

1.2.38) A letter to the editor, requesting the return of citizenship to Solzhenitsyn and the publication of his books in Russia, under the pseudonym V. Tret′yakov. Key dates: (i) 02/09/1988 - published in *Книжное обозрение.*

a) (Третьяков В.) (письмо редактору) – Книжное обозрение 02/09/1988, №36.

1.2.39) *Евангелие от Марка: Предисловие к новому переводу В. Н. Кузнецовой (Mark's*

Gospel: An Introduction to the new translation by V. N. Kuznetsova). Key dates: (i) 1989 - published in *Народы Азии и Африки*.

a) Евангелие от Марка: Предисловие к новому переводу В. Н. Кузнецовой - Народы Азии и Африки, 1989, №6, 112-114.

1.2.40) *Камень, который отвергли строители: Размышления, навеянные романом Мигеля Отеро Сильвы (The Stone the Builders Rejected: Reflections suggested by the novel of Miguel Otero Silva)*. Key dates: (i) 1989 - published in *Иностранная литература;* (ii) 1990 – prepared for inclusion in *Трудный путь к диалогу (A Hard Path to Dialogue)*.

a) Камень, который отвергли строители: Размышления, навеянные романом Мигеля Отеро Сильвы - Иностранная литература, 1989, №11, 244-248.
b) Камень, который отвергли строители: Размышления, навеянные романом Мигеля Отеро Сильвы - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Радуга, 1992.
c) Камень, который отвергли строители: Размышления, навеянные романом Мигеля Отеро Сильвы - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2001.
d) Камень, который отвергли строители: Размышления, навеянные романом Мигеля Отеро Сильвы - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 169-184.

1.2.41) *К новому переводу книги Екклесиста: Предисловие (Concerning a New Translation of the Book of Ecclesiastes: Foreword)*, introduction to a new translation by I. M. D′yakonov. Key dates: (i) 1989 - published in *Детектив и политика;* (ii) 1990 – prepared for inclusion in *Трудный путь к диалогу (A Hard Path to Dialogue)*. Related works: (i) It is distinct from (1.2.61), which relates to a different translation of Ecclesiastes.

a) К новому переводу книги Екклесиста: Предисловие - Детектив и политика, 1989, №3, 322-326.

b) К новому переводу книги Екклесиста: Предисловие - Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 115-118.

c) Экклесиаст и современность - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Радуга, 1992.

d) Экклесиаст и современность - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2001.

e) Экклесиаст и современность - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 47-53.

1.2.42) *Контакт: О фильмах А. Тарковского (Contact: About the Films of A. Tarkovskii).* Key dates: (i) 1989 - published in *Искусство кино* and in Latvian in *Kino* as *Par garīgumu (For Spirituality).* (ii) 1990 – prepared for inclusion in *Трудный путь к диалогу (A Hard Path to Dialogue)*.

a) Контакт: О фильмах А. Тарковского – Искусство кино 1989, №7, 39-44.

b) 'Par garīgumu', trans., N Bol′shakova, *Kino,* Riga, 1989, 7, 14-19.

c) Контакт: О фильмах А. Тарковского – Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 423-431.

d) Контакт: О фильмах А. Тарковского - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Радуга, 1992.

e) Контакт: О фильмах А. Тарковского - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2001.

f) Контакт: О фильмах А. Тарковского - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 159-168.

1.2.43) *Трудный путь к диалогу: О романе Г. Грина «Монсеньор Кихот» (A Hard Path to Dialogue: About the Novel "Monsignor Quixote").* Key dates: (i) 1989 - published in *Иностранная литература;* (ii) 1990 – prepared for inclusion in *Трудный путь к диалогу*

(A Hard Path to Dialogue).

a) Трудный путь к диалогу: О романе Г. Грина «Монсеньор Кихот» - Иностранная литература, 1989, №1, 209-213.

c) Трудный путь к диалогу: О романе Г. Грина «Монсеньор Кихот» – Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 328-343.

d) Трудный путь к диалогу: О романе Г. Грина «Монсеньор Кихот» - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Радуга, 1992.

e) Трудный путь к диалогу: О романе Г. Грина «Монсеньор Кихот» - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2001.

f) Трудный путь к диалогу: О романе Г. Грина «Монсеньор Кихот» - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 19-32.

1.2.44) *Религия, «культ личности» и секулярное государство (Заметки историка религии) (Religion, Personality Cult and Secular Government: The Notes of a Historian of Religion).* Key dates: (i) 1989 - published in the collection *На пути к свободе совести (On the Way to Freedom of Conscience);* (ii) 1990 – prepared for inclusion in *Трудный путь к диалогу (A Hard Path to Dialogue)*.

a) Религия, «культ личности» и секулярное государство (Заметки историка религии) – На пути к свободе совести. М.: Прогресс, 1989, 88-111.

b) Религия, «культ личности» и секулярное государство – Мегаполис-Экспресс 20/09/1990, №21, 3. (excerpt)

c) Религия, «культ личности» и секулярное государство – Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 378-413.

d) Религия, «культ личности» и секулярное государство - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Радуга, 1992.

e) ‘Religion, the “Cult of Personality” and the Secular State’, *Christianity for the Twenty-First Century: The Prophetic Writings of Alexander Men,* ed. Roberts, Elizabeth and Ann Shukman, (New York: Continuum, 1996), 107-138.

f) Магия, Оккультизм, Христианство. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1996, 69-75. (excerpt)

g) Религия, «культ личности» и секулярное государство - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2001.

h) Религия, «культ личности» и секулярное государство - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008. 102-134.

1.2.45) *Почему нужны нам «возвращенные имена»? (Why do we need “Restored Names”?)*. Key dates: (i) 21/03/1989 - published in *Станколиния;* (ii) 1990 – prepared for inclusion in *Трудный путь к диалогу (A Hard Path to Dialogue)*.

a) Почему нужны нам «возвращенные имена»? - Станколиния 21/03/1989, №10: 108, 4.

b) Почему нужны нам «возвращенные имена»?- Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Радуга, 1992.

c) Почему нужны нам «возвращенные имена»? - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2001.

d) Почему нужны нам «возвращенные имена»? - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 185-191.

1.2.46) *Печальное приключение памятника (The Sorrowful Adventure of a Memorial)*. Key dates: (i) 26/04/1989 - published in *Вечерняя Москва.*

a) Печальное приключение памятника - Вечерняя Москва. 26/04/1989, №97 (19881), 2.

1.2.47) *Познание добра и зла (The Knowledge of Good and Evil)*. Key dates: (i) 21/10/1989

– published in *Советская культура*; (ii) 1990 – prepared for inclusion in *Трудный путь к диалогу (A Hard Path to Dialogue)*.

a) Познание добра и зла - Советская культура, 21/10/1989, 14.

b) Познание добра и зла – Спутник, 1990, №12, 16-18. (abridged)

c) Познание добра и зла – Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 30-49

d) Познание добра и зла - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Радуга, 1992.

e) Искушения сатаны - Магия, Оккультизм, Христианство. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1996. (excerpt)

f) Познание добра и зла - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2001.

g) Познание добра и зла - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 66-84.

1.2.48) *К миру призвал нас Господь (The Lord called us to the World).* Key dates: (i) 1989 - published in *Протестант*.

a) К миру призвал нас Господь – Протестант. 1989, 14.

1.2.49) *Рождественская проповедь: «Карабах» или «Вифлеем»? (A Christmas Sermon: "Karabakh" or "Bethlehem"?)* is a short article, not a sermon. Key dates: (i) 1989 - published in *Совершенно секретно;* (ii) 1990 – prepared for inclusion in *Трудный путь к диалогу (A Hard Path to Dialogue)*.

a) Рождественская проповедь: «Карабах» или «Вифлеем»? - Совершенно секретно, 12/1989, №7, 12-13.

b) Рождественская проповедь: «Карабах» или «Вифлеем»? – Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 413-423.

c) Рождественская проповедь: «Карабах» или «Вифлеем»? - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.:

Радуга, 1992.

d) 'The Christian Hope: "Karabakh" or "Bethlehem"?' *Christianity for the Twenty-First Century: The Prophetic Writings of Alexander Men,* ed. Roberts, Elizabeth and Ann Shukman, (New York: Continuum, 1996), 173-178.

e) Рождественская проповедь: «Карабах» или «Вифлеем»? - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2001.

f) Рождественская размышление: «Карабах» или «Вифлеем»? - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 41-46.

1.2.50) *Библия (The Bible).* Key dates: (i) 1990 - published in *Наше наследие.* Related works: (i) article *The World of the Bible* (1.2.70)*;* (ii) *How to Read the Bible* (1.1.5).

a) Библия - Наше наследие. 1990, №1(13), 131-141.

b) Библия – Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 71-95.

1.2.51) *И все-таки после смерти жизнь (And nonetheless after Death there is Life).* Key dates: (i) 1990 - published in *Собеседник*.

a) И все-таки после смерти жизнь - Собеседник, 1990, №1, 6.

1.2.52) *К проблематике «осевого времени». Надконфессиональная и христоцентрическая трактовка (Concerning the Problematic of the "Axial Period": A Non-denominational and Christocentric Interpretation).* Key dates: (i) 1990 - published in *Народы Азии и Африки*; (ii) 1990 – prepared for inclusion in *Трудный путь к диалогу (A Hard Path to Dialogue)*.

a) К проблематике «осевого времени». Надконфессиональная и христоцентрическая трактовка - Народы Азии и Африки, 1990, №1, 68-77.

b) К проблематике «осевого времени». Надконфессиональная и христоцентрическая трактовка - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Радуга, 1992.

c) 'Christianity: The Universal Vision', *Christianity for the Twenty-First Century: The Prophetic Writings of Alexander Men,* ed. Roberts, Elizabeth and Ann Shukman, (New York: Continuum, 1996), 75-103.

d) К проблематике «осевого времени». Надконфессиональная и христоцентрическая трактовка - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2001.

e) К проблематике «осевого времени». Надконфессиональная и христоцентрическая трактовка - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 192-227.

1.2.53) *От автора: О книге «Сын человеческий» (From the Author: About the Book "Son of Man"),* a Foreword to a journal edition of *Son of Man.* Key dates: (i) 1990 – published in *Смена.* Related works: (i) *Son of Man* (1.1.1).

a) От автора: О книге «Сын человеческий» - Смена, 1990, №6, 225-228.

1.2.54) *«Отцы» Латинской Америки: К 500-летию открытия Америки. Встреча культур и континентов ("Fathers" of Latin America: Concerning the 500th Anniversary of the Discovery of America. A Meeting of Cultures and Continents).* Key dates: (i) 1990 - published in *Латинская Америка;* (ii) 1990 – prepared for inclusion in *Трудный путь к диалогу (A Hard Path to Dialogue)* under the title *Поборники человечности (Advocates of Humanity).*

a) «Отцы» Латинской Америки: К 500-летию открытия Америки. Встреча культур и континентов - Латинская Америка, 1990, №2, 68-80.

b) «Отцы» Латинской Америки: К 500-летию открытия Америки. Встреча культур и континентов - Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 283-297.

c) Поборники человечности - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Радуга, 1992.

d) Поборники человечности - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2001.

e) Поборники человечности - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 228-244.

1.2.55) *Предисловие к книге М. Поповского «Жизнь и житие Войно-Ясенецкого, архиепископа и хирурга» (Foreword to the Book by M. Popovskii: "The Life and Biography of Voino-Yasenitsky, Archbishop and Surgeon").* Key dates: (i) 1990 - published in *Октябрь.* Related works: (i) article *Archbishop Lukas Voino-Yasenitskii* (1.2.30).

a) Предисловие к книге М. Поповского «Жизнь и житие Войно-Ясенецкого, архиепископа и хирурга» - Октябрь, 1990, №2, 3-4.

b) Предисловие к книге М. Поповского «Жизнь и житие Войно-Ясенецкого, архиепископа и хирурга» - Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 437-439.

c) О себе... М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2007, 192-193. (excerpt)

1.2.56) *Дорогой надежды (On the Way of Hope).* Key dates: (i) 1990 - published in *Пионерская правда*.

a) Дорогой надежды - Пионерская правда, 03/02/1990, №15, 3.

1.2.57) *Обращение ко всем, от кого это зависит (An Address to All Upon Whom it Depends).* Key dates: (i) 1990 - published in *Огонек*.

a) Обращение ко всем, от кого это зависит - Огонек, 18/04/1990, 25.

b) Обращение ко всем, от кого это зависит – Филина О. Слово живо, https://www.kommersant.ru/doc/2800166 [Accessed 20/04/18].

1.2.58) *О книге Надежды Мандельстам (About the Book by Nadezhda Mandelstam)*. Key dates: (i) 1990 - published in *Литературная обозрение;* (ii) 1990 – reworked and incorporated into article *Свидетели (Witnesses)*. Related works: (i) article *Witnesses;* (ii) article *According to Vows of Mercy.*

a) О книге Надежды Мандельстам - Литературная обозрение, 1990, №5, pp. 67-68.

1.2.59) *Молодежь и идеалы (Youth and Ideals)*. Key dates: (i) 1990 - published in *Совершенно секретно;* (ii) 1990 – prepared for inclusion in *Трудный путь к диалогу (A Hard Path to Dialogue)*.

a) Молодежь и идеалы - Совершенно секретно, 1990, №2, 9.

b) Молодежь и идеалы - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Радуга, 1992.

c) Приложение 18 - Бычков С. С. Хроника нераскрытого убийства. М.: Русское рекламное издательствоб 1996.

d) Молодежь и идеалы - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2001.

e) Молодежь и идеалы - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 33-40.

1.2.60) *Разум и исступление масс (The Mind and the Delirium of the Masses)*. Key dates: (i) 28/07/1990 - published in *Советская культура;* (ii) 1990 – prepared for inclusion in *Трудный путь к диалогу (A Hard Path to Dialogue)* as *Демократия и толпа (Democracy and the Crowd)*.

a) Разум и исступление масс - Советская культура, 28/07/1990.

b) Разум и исступление масс - Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 374-378.

c) Демократия и толпа - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Радуга, 1992.

d) Демократия и толпа - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2001.

e) Демократия и толпа - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 135-140.

Articles first published posthumously (for dates of posthumous publications see *Bibliographies*)

1.2.61) *К переводу Экклесиаста Г. Плисецкого (Concerning the Translation of Ecclesiastes by G. Plisetskii)*. Related works: (i) It is distinct from (1.2.41), which relates to a different translation of Ecclesiastes.

a) К переводу Экклесиаста Г. Плисецкого – Символ, 07/1996, №35, 181-182.

1.2.62) *Доверяй, но проверяй (Несколько слов о статье Л. Толстого «Верьте себе») (Trust, but Verify: A Few Words about the Article by L. Tolstoy "Believe Yourself")*.

a) Доверяй, но проверяй (Несколько слов о статье Л. Толстого «Верьте себе») - Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 235-237.

1.2.63) *По заветам милосердия: Сестра Мадлен и Малые сестры (According to Vows of Mercy: Sister Magdalen and the Poor Sisters)*. Key dates: (i) 1990 – reworked and incorporated into article *Свидетели (Witnesses)*. Related works: (i) article *Witnesses;* (ii)

article *About the Book by Nadezhda Mandelstam* (1.2.58).

a) По заветам милосердия: Сестра Мадлен и Малые сестры – Московский комсомолец, 10/06/1991.

b) По заветам милосердия: Сестра Мадлен и Малые сестры – Христианос, Рига, 10/2001.

1.2.64) *Тайна жизни и смерти: Заявка на сценарий (The Mystery of Life and Death: Call for a Script)*.

a) Тайна жизни и смерти: Заявка на сценарий – Литературная газета 23/01/1991, №5329, 15.

1.2.65) *Встреча (Encounter).* Key dates: (i) 1990 – prepared for inclusion in *Трудный путь к диалогу (A Hard Path to Dialogue).*

a) Встреча – Наука и религия, 1991, №1, 7-12.

b) Встреча – Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 237-258.

c) Встреча – Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Радуга, 1992.

d) Встреча – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1995.

e) Встреча – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1997.

f) Встреча – Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2001.

g) Встреча – Русская религиозная философия. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2003.

h) Встреча – Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 268-279.

i) Встреча – Русская религиозная философия. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 142-180.

j) 'The Encounter and Meeting' - *Russian Religious Philosophy: 1989-1990 Lectures,* trans. Stephen Janos, (Mohrsville PA.: FRSJ Publications, 2015), 69-84.

1.2.66) Review of C. S. Lewis, *Расторжение брака (The Great Divorce)*.

a) Расторжение брака – Европейские ведомости, 1991, №2, 2.

1.2.67) *В поисках подлинного Христа: Евангельские мотивы в западной литературой (In Search of the Genuine Christ: Gospel Motifs in Western Literature),* in draft form only.

a) В поисках подлинного Христа: Евангельские мотивы в западной литературой – Иностранная литература, 1991, №3, 237-247.
b) В поисках подлинного Христа: Евангельские мотивы в западной литературой – Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 298-327.
c) В поисках подлинного Христа – Библия и литература. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002.
d) В поисках подлинного Христа – Библия и литература. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, 368-415.

1.2.68) *Экклезиологические тезисы (в связи с материалами II Ватиканского Собора) (Ecclesiological Theses: In Connection with the Materials of the Second Vatican Council)*. Key dates: (i) 1982? - article written and circulated among parishioners, but not formally published.[986]

a) Экклезиологические тезисы (в связи с материалами II Ватиканского Собора) – Символ. (date unknown)
b) Экклезиологические тезисы (в связи с материалами II Ватиканского Собора) – Истина и жизнь: Католический вестник, 1991, №9, 11-13.

1.2.69) *Мир Библии (The World of the Bible)*. Key dates: (i) 1988 – Men considered its

[986] See Василенко Л.И., Мень о католичестве: комментарии - «Теология» №5, 1993, М., 113-128. http://bdn-steiner.ru/modules/Books/files/3605.pdf [Accessed 23/04/18].

inclusion as Foreword to *How to Read the Bible.* Related works: (i) article *The Bible* (1.2.50); (ii) *How to Read the Bible* (1.1.5).

a) Библия - Наше наследие. 1990, №1(13), 131-141.

b) Мир библии - Мир библии. М.: Книжная палата, 1990.

c) Библия – Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 71-95.

d) Мир библии - Как читать Библию: Руководство к чтению книг Ветхого и Нового Завета. Часть первая. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1997.

e) Мир библии - Как читать Библию: Руководство к чтению книг Ветхого и Нового Завета. Часть первая. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2005, 17-46.

1.2.70) *Вместить невместимое (Insert the Incompatible),*[987] a Foreword to the publication of poems by Boris Evseev.

a) Вместить невместимое – Литературная газета, 29/04/1992, 7.

1.2.71) *Всегда нужно быть готовым (It is always Necessary to be Prepared)*.

a) Всегда нужно быть готовым – Третье сословие, 1992, №5, 10.

1.2.72) *Эксперимент безрелигиозного общества (The Experiment of the Religionless Society)*.

a) Эксперимент безрелигиозного общества – Известия 16/04/1992, 71.

1.2.73) *Послесловие к роману Грэм Грина «Сила и слава» (Afterword for the Novel by*

[987] This is an untranslatable word play.

Graham Greene "The Power and the Glory"). Related works: (i) Men's translation of "The Power and the Glory" (1.1.14).

a) Послесловие к роману Грэм Грина «Сила и слава» - Новая Европа, 1995, №7, 121-122.

1.2.74) *Трагедия гении (The Tragedy of a Genius),* also known as *«Богословие» Льва Толстого и Христианство (The "Theology" of Lev Tolstoy and Christianity).* Key dates: (i) 1990 – prepared for inclusion in *Трудный путь к диалогу (A Hard Path to Dialogue).*

a) «Богословие» Льва Толстого и Христианство - Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 216-235.
b) Трагедия гении - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Радуга, 1992.
c) Трагедия гении - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2001.
d) Трагедия гении - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 245-267.

1.2.75) *Суеверия, разум, вера (Superstition, Mind, Faith).* Key dates: (i) 1990 – prepared for inclusion in *Трудный путь к диалогу (A Hard Path to Dialogue).*

a) Суеверия, разум, вера - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Радуга, 1992.
b) Суеверия, разум, вера - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2001.
c) Суеверия, разум, вера - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 11-18.

1.2.76) *«Жизнь после жизни» ("Life after Life"),* a response to the book by R. Moody. Key dates: (i) 1990 – prepared for inclusion in *Трудный путь к диалогу (A Hard Path to Dialogue).* Related works: (i) it is distinct from the lectures *Life after Life.*

a) «Жизнь после жизни» - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Радуга, 1992.

b) «Жизнь после жизни» - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2001.

c) «Жизнь после жизни» - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 151-158.

1.2.77) *Возвращение к истокам: Об историке Г. П. Федотове (A Return to the Sources: About the Historian G. P. Fedotov)*. Key dates: (i) 1990 – prepared for inclusion in *Трудный путь к диалогу (A Hard Path to Dialogue)*.

a) Возвращение к истокам: Об историке Г. П. Федотове - Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 259-278.

b) Возвращение к истокам: Об историке Г. П. Федотове - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Радуга, 1992.

c) Возвращение к истокам: Об историке Г. П. Федотове - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2001.

d) Возвращение к истокам: Об историке Г. П. Федотове - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 290-313.

1.2.78) *Свидетели (Witnesses)* – articles on Nadezhda Mandelshtam, Sergei Zheludkov, and Sister Magdalen. Key dates: (i) 1990 – prepared for inclusion in *Трудный путь к диалогу (A Hard Path to Dialogue)*. Related works: (i) article on Nadezhda Mandelshtam (1.2.58); (ii) article on Sister Magdalen (1.2.63).

a) О книге Надежды Мандельстам - Литературная обозрение, 1990, №5, pp. 67-68.

b) По заветам милосердия: Сестра Мадлен и Малые сестры – Московский комсомолец, 10/06/1991.

c) По заветам милосердия: Сестра Мадлен и Малые сестры – Христианос, Рига, 10/2001.

d) Свидетели - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Радуга, 1992.

e) Свидетели - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2001.

f) Свидетели - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 326-338.

1.2.79) *Два интерпретатора Евангельской истории (Two Interpreters of Gospel History),* character studies of Renan and Schweitzer. Key dates: (i) 1990 – prepared for inclusion in *Трудный путь к диалогу (A Hard Path to Dialogue).*

a) Парадоксы Альберта Швейцера - Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 344-350. (Schweitzer only)

b) Два интерпретатора Евангельской истории - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Радуга, 1992.

c) Два интерпретатора Евангельской истории - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2001.

d) Два интерпретатора Евангельской истории - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 339-361.

1.2.80) *О библейских пророках (On the Biblical Prophets),* including sections i) the Shepherd Amos; ii) Isaiah; iii) Jeremiah; iv) "By the Rivers of Babylon"; v) Hopes and Disappointments; vi) Last Word, the Books of Ruth and Jonah. Key dates: (I) 1980-1987? - written.[988]

a) О библейских пророках – Символ. (date unknown)

b) О библейских пророках – Христианос III, 1994, 89-118.

1.2.81) *Памятка начинающему священнику (Handbook for a Novice Priest)*.

[988] Maslenikova destroyed its first page with the title and author so it could not become incriminating evidence during KGB searches. See http://www.alexandrmen.ru [Accessed 01/05/18]. This suggests it was written during the period of intensive KGB searches from 1980-1987.

а) Памятка начинающему священнику – Символ. (date unknown)

1.2.82) *Пьер Тейар де Шарден: христианин и ученый (Pierre Teilhard de Chardin: Christian and Scientist),* a *Foreword* to the Russian translation of Teilhard's book *Le milieu divin.*

а) Пьер Тейар де Шарден: христианин и ученый - Тейар де Шарден П. Божественная среда. СПб: Ренессанс, 1992.

1.3) Interviews (or Dialogues)[989]

Early interviews

1.3.1) *О любви и семье (On Love and the Family).* Key dates: (i) 1967 – conducted.

1.3.2) *Евреи и христианство (Jews and Christianity).* Key dates: (i) 1975 – conducted by A. Shoikhet and published in samizdat journal *Евреи в СССР;* (ii) 1976 - republished in *Вестник РХД.*

a) Евреи и христианство - Евреи в СССР, №11, 1975. Самиздат.

b) Евреи и христианство - Вестник РХД, (Париж), I.1976, №117. 112-117.

c) Приложение 10 - Бычков С. С. Хроника нераскрытого убийства. М.: Русское рекламное издательство, 1996.

1.3.3) *Интервью на случай ареста (Interview in Case of Arrest).* Key dates: (i) 1978 – conducted by 'Correspondent N'.[990]

a) Интервью на случай ареста - Вестник РХД, II.1990: №159, 298-306.

b) Интервью на случай ареста - Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 356-363.

c) Интервью на случай ареста - О себе... М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2007, 209-218.

1.3.4) *Богу нужна только правда (God Wants only the Truth).* Key dates: (i) 30/09/1982 –

[989] The titles of these interviews (and dialogues) were not usually chosen by Men himself.

[990] Men gave strict instructions it should be kept in a secret location (unpublished) unless he was arrested. See Вестник РХД, II.1990: №159, 298.

conducted by a ‘visitor from Barnaul’.

Interviews published between 01/01/1988 and 09/09/1990

1.3.5) *Проблемы Церкви изнутри (The Problems of the Church from the Inside).* Key dates: (i) 1988 - published in *Символ.*

a) Проблемы Церкви изнутри – Символ (Париж), 1988, №20, 37-41.
b) Проблемы Церкви изнутри - Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 440-445.

1.3.6) *Kura daleko nie poleci: Z księdzem Aleksandrem Mieniem z Moskwy rozmawia Artur Michalski (The Hen will not Fly away: Artur Michalski Talks to Father Aleksander Men from Moscow).* Key dates: (I) 10/1988 – conducted by Artur Michalski; (ii) 1989 – published (in Polish) in *Powściągliwość i praca: Wudawany nakladem XX Michalitow.*

a) ‘Kura daleko nie poleci: Z księdzem Aleksandrem Mieniem z Moskwy rozmawia Artur Michalski’, *Powściągliwość i praca: Wudawany nakladem XX Michalitow,* 1989. 12 (471).
b) ‘Kura daleko nie poleci: Z księdzem Aleksandrem Mieniem z Moskwy rozmawia Artur Michalski’, *Na gruzach totalitaryzmu. Rozmowy o odradzaniu się chrześcijaństwa w Rosji*, Warszawa 1991, 11-15.

1.3.7) *Русская интеллигенция всегда отличалась терпимостью (The Russian Intelligentsia was always Distinguished by its Patience)*. Key dates: (i) 1989 – conducted by M. Deich; (ii) 1990 – published (without a title) in *Страна и мир.*

a) (untitled) - Страна и мир, 1990, №4(58), 10-13.

b) Русская интеллигенция всегда отличалась терпимостью – Вечерний клуб, 09/09/1995, №1039.

1.3.8) *Przebudzenie: Z ojcem Alexandrem Mieniem, duszpasterem moskiewskiej inteligencji (Awakening: with Father Alexander Men, Pastor of the Moscow Intelligentsia).* Key dates: (i) 02/04/1989 – conducted by Marcin Przeciszewski; (ii) 28/05/1989 - published (in Polish) in *Ład: Katolicki Tygodnik Społecyny*.

a) 'Przebudzenie: Z ojcem Alexandrem Mieniem, duszpasterem moskiewskiej inteligencji', *Ład: Katolicki Tygodnik Społecyny,* Warszawa 1989, 22 (28.5), 8.

1.3.9) *Стрела на натянутой тетиве (The Arrow on a Drawn Bowstring).* Key dates: (i) 1989 - conducted by I Bystrova and published in *Московский комсомолец;* (ii) 1990 – prepared for inclusion in *Трудный путь к диалогу (A Hard Path to Dialogue)* under the title *На переломе (At the Turning Point).*

a) Стрела на натянутой тетиве - Московский комсомолец, 24/05/1989, №120, 2.

b) На переломе - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Радуга, 1992.

1.3.10) *От сердца к сердцу (From Heart to Heart).* Key dates: (i) 1989 - conducted by O. Smirnov and published in *Маяк*.

a) От сердца к сердцу - Маяк, 18/07/1989, №86 (7772), 3.

1.3.11) *О духовности (On Spirituality).* Key dates: (i) 1989 - conducted by N. Bolshakova

and published in *Кино* (Riga) in Russian and Latvian; (ii) 1990 – prepared for inclusion in *Трудный путь к диалогу (A Hard Path to Dialogue).* Related works: (i) article *Contact* (1.2.42).[991]

a) О духовности - Кино 1989, №7, 14-16.

b) О духовности - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Радуга, 1992.

c) О духовности - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2001.

d) О духовности - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 141-150.

e) О духовности – Любить Бога и любить человека. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2012, 253-271.

1.3.12) *Жить в надежде и вере (To Live in Hope and Faith).* Key dates: (i) 11/1989 - conducted by V. Molodyi and published in *Совершенно секретно*.

a) Жить в надежде и вере - Совершенно секретно, 11/1989, №6.

1.3.13) *Бояться нечего (There is Nothing to Fear).* Key dates: (i) 25/11/1989 - published (in Italian) in *Il Sabato.*

a) Бояться нечего – Il Sabato, 25/11/1989.

1.3.14) *Добро и зло приемлем равнодушно? (Shall we Accept Good and Evil with Indifference?).* Key dates: (i) 1990 - conducted by O. Nemukhina and published in *Ogonek.*

a) Добро и зло приемлем равнодушно? - Огонек, 1990, №13, 20-23.

b) Добро и зло приемлем равнодушно? - Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво,

[991] This interview was published in the Latvian edition of the journal together with 'Par garīgumu' (For Spirituality) (1.2.42).

1992, 363-373.

1.3.15) *Рождество Христово (The Birth of Christ).* Key dates: (i) 03/01/1990 - conducted by S. Bychkov and published in *Московский комсомолец*.

a) Рождество Христово - Московский комсомолец 03/01/1990, 3.

1.3.16) *1990: Как мы проживем этот год? (1990: How shall we live through this year?).* Key dates: (i) 03/01/1990 - published in *Литературная газета.*

a) 1990: Как мы проживем этот год? - Литературная газета, 03/01/1990, 13.

b) Тревоги, надежды, планы - Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 355-356.

1.3.17) *Прислушаться к бытию (Listen to Existence).* Key dates: (i) 1990 - conducted by O. Smirnov and published in *За инженерные кадры.*

a) Прислушаться к бытию - За инженерные кадры, 13/02/1990, №4, 2.

b) Прислушаться к бытию – Подмосковье, 27/10/1990, 8.

1.3.18) *Время собирать камни (Time to Gather Stones).* Key dates: (i) 04/03/1990 - conducted by L. Fomenko and published in *Ленинское Знамя*.

a) Время собирать камни - Ленинское Знамя, 04/03/1990.

1.3.19) *Люди враждебные к чужим конфессиям, очень плохо их знают (People who are*

Antagonistic towards other Confessions Know them very Badly). Key dates: (i) 1990 - conducted by P. Sirkes and published in Ottawa in a limited circulation publication.

a) Люди враждебные к чужим конфессиям, очень плохо их знают - ? Ottawa, 1990.

b) Люди враждебные к чужим конфессиям, очень плохо их знают – Независимая газета, 25/01/1992, №16(187), 6.

1.3.20) *Имя, бывшее под запретом (The Name that was Forbidden)*. Key dates: (i) conducted by E. Konstantinova and published in *Советская молодежь* on 6th June 1990. (ii) reprinted in *Маяк* on 6th Sep. 1990.

a) Имя, бывшее под запретом - Советская молодежь, 06/06/1990, 1,4.

b) Имя, бывшее под запретом - Маяк, 06/09/1990, 3.

Interviews of unspecified date, or from 1988-1990, published posthumously

1.3.21) *Сын человеческий (Son of Man),* conducted by Sergei Bychkov.

a) Сын человеческий – Московский комсомолец, 16/09/1990, №213, 2.

1.3.22) *Александр Мень: последняя встреча (Alexander Men: The Final Meeting),* conducted by E. Konstantinova.

a) Александр Мень: последняя встреча – На боевом посту, 27/10/1990, 6.

1.3.23) *Последнее интервью о. Александра Меня (The Last Interview of Fr. Alexander Men),* conducted by P. Bonet.

a) Последнее интервью о. Александра Меня – El Pais, 12/1990, No.13, 1-2, No. 14, 3.

b) Последнее интервью о. Александра Меня – Столица, 08/1991, №31/32, 108-110. (abridged)

c) Из беседы с П. Бонет - Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 445-450. (excerpt)

d) 'The Russian Orthodox Church Today', Christianity for the Twenty-First Century: The Prophetic Writings of Alexander Men, ed. Roberts, Elizabeth and Ann Shukman, (New York: Continuum, 1996), 164-170.

e) Последнее интервью о. Александра Меня - О себе... М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2007, 274-283.

1.3.24) *Несколько слов к концу спора (A Few Words Towards the End of an Argument)*, originally conducted by the journal *Юность* Key dates: (i) 1990 – prepared for inclusion in *Трудный путь к диалогу (A Hard Path to Dialogue)* under the title *Конец спора? (The End of the Argument?).*

a) Несколько слов к концу спора – Мегаполис-Экспресс, 20/06/1991, 6.

b) Несколько слов к концу спора - Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 450-469.

c) Конец спора? - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Радуга, 1992.

d) Конец спора? - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2001.

e) Конец спора? - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 85-101.

1.3.25) *О Галиче (On Galich).*

a) О Галиче – Литературная газета, 04/09/1991, №35 (5361), 14.

b) О Галиче - Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 434-437.

c) О Галиче - О себе... М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2007, 194-197.

1.3.26) *Можно ли реформировать православную церковь? (Is it Possible to Reform the Orthodox Church?)*.

a) Можно ли реформировать православную церковь? - Независимая газета 10/09/1991, 6.

1.3.27) *Быть христианином (Why be a Christian?).* Key dates: (i) 29/07/1990 - conducted by Mark Makarov.

a) Быть христианином. М.: Русская апологетика, 1992.

b) Быть христианином. М.: Благовестник, 1995.

c) 'Why be a Christian?', Christianity for the Twenty-First Century: The Prophetic Writings of Alexander Men, ed. Roberts, Elizabeth and Ann Shukman, (New York: Continuum, 1996), 29-38.

d) Быть христианином. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2007.

e) Быть христианином. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009.

1.3.28) *Беседа о вере и спасении (Conversation About Faith and Salvation),* a dialogue between Vladimir Ilyushenko and Alexander Men.

a) Беседа о вере и спасении - Илюшенко В. И. Отец Александр Мень: Жизнь, смерть, бессмертие. М.: Эксмо книгоноша, 2013, 639-646.

1.3.29) *Что происходит с нашей культурой? (What is Happening with our Culture?).* Key dates: (i) 1990 – prepared for inclusion in *Трудный путь к диалогу (A Hard Path to Dialogue).*

a) Что происходит с нашей культурой? - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Радуга, 1992.

b) 'Russia in Crisis', *Christianity for the Twenty-First Century: The Prophetic Writings of Alexander Men*, ed. Roberts, Elizabeth and Ann Shukman, (New York: Continuum, 1996), 139-150.

c) Что происходит с нашей культурой? - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2001.

d) Что происходит с нашей культурой? - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 54-65.

1.3.30) *Духовный опыт и «опиум народа» (Spiritual Experience and the "Opium of the People"),* conducted by O. Goryachev.

a) Духовный опыт и «опиум народа» - Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 431-434.

1.3.31) *Пять вопросов к отцу Александру и его ответы (Five Questions to Father Alexander and His Anwers),* conducted by N. Bolshakova.[992] Related works: (i) book *A Practical Guide to Prayer* (1.1.6).

a) Пять вопросов к отцу Александру и его ответы - Практическое руководство к молитве. (ред. Н. Большакова). Рига: ФиАМ, 1991.

[992] N. Bolshakova submitted written questions to Alexander Men by letter, and he recorded his answers on a cassette.

1.3.32) *О времени и о себе (About Time and Myself)*.

a) Приложение 9 - Бычков С. С. Хроника нераскрытого убийства. М.: Русское рекламное издательство, 1996.

1.3.33) A Conversation (Dialogue) with Oleg Drobinskii.

a) Радость служения. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2013, 296.

1.3.34) *Беседа о педагогике (Dialogue on Pedagogy),* conducted by Sergei Solov′ev.

a) Беседа о педагогике - Радость служения. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2013, 146-163.

1.3.35) *Владимир Соловьев и Русский религиозный ренессанс (Vladimir Solov'ev and the Russian Religious Renaissance).*

a) Приложение 9 - Бычков С. С. Хроника нераскрытого убийства. М.: Русское рекламное издательство, 1996.

1.3.36) *О Церкви (On the Church).*

a) Приложение 9 - Бычков С. С. Хроника нераскрытого убийства. М.: Русское рекламное издательство, 1996.

1.4) Lectures[993]

Lectures outside USSR (3 lectures)

1.4.1) *Основания культурного единства (The Foundations of Cultural Unity),* International Symposium, Bergamo, Italy, 02/11/1989.

1.4.2) *Человек в библейской аксиологии (Humanity in Biblical Axiology)*, Soviet-American Symposium. Key dates: (i) April 1990 – lecture given; (ii) 1990 – prepared for inclusion in *Трудный путь к диалогу (A Hard Path to Dialogue).*

a) Человек в библейской аксиологии - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Радуга, 1992.
b) Человек в библейской аксиологии - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2001.
c) Человек в библейской аксиологии - Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 314-325.

1.4.3) *Индивидуальное и массовое сознание: Материалы Вайнгартенского симпозиума (Individual and Mass Consciousness: Materials from the Weingarten Symposium).* Key dates: (i) May 1990 – lecture given; (ii) 1990 - published in Иностранная литература.

a) Индивидуальное и массовое сознание: Материалы Вайнгартенского симпозиума - Иностранная литература, 1990, №11, 213 & 222.

[993] None of the 113 lectures listed were published before Men's death, although Men prepared two of the three foreign lectures for publication. 'Key dates' are only included for these two lectures. Dates listed after the titles are the dates the lecture was given, not published. Titles are also often later additions, therefore should be seen as provisional.

1.4.4) *Личность Иисуса Христа: Как она воспринималось на протяжении веков (The Person of Jesus Christ: How it has been Understood through the Centuries),* 19/02/1988.

a) Личность Иисуса Христа: Как она воспринималось на протяжении веков - Радостная весть. М.: Вита-центр, 1992.
b) Личность Иисуса Христа: Как она воспринималось на протяжении веков - Книга надежды. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011.

1.4.5) *Вера и культура (Faith and Culture),* 07/1988.

a) Вера и культура - Радостная весть. М.: Вита-центр, 1992.

1.4.6) *Христианская культура на Руси (Christian Culture in Rus),* 07/1988.

a) Христианская культура на Руси - Радостная весть. М.: Вита-центр, 1992.
b) Христианская культура на Руси - Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 147-152.

1.4.7) *Христианство и культура* (Christianity and Culture), Moscow 'House of Doctors', 19/10/1988.

1.4.8) *Сущность Христианства* (The Meaning of Christianity), 22/10/1988.

a) Сущность Христианства - Радостная весть. М.: Вита-центр, 1992.
b) Сущность Христианства - Книга надежды. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011.

1.4.9) *О переводах Библии (On Translations of the Bible),* also known as *1000 лет и 2000 языков (1000 Years and 2000 Languages),* Library of Foreign Literature*,* 03/11/1988.

a) О переводах Библии - Книга надежды. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011.

1.4.10) *Христианство и культура* (Christianity and Culture), FIAN, 14/12/1988.

1.4.11) *Два пути понимания христианства (Two Ways of Understanding Christianity),* 25/01/1989.

a) Два пути понимания христианства - Радостная весть. М.: Вита-центр, 1992.

b) 'Two Understandings of Christianity', *Christianity for the Twenty-First Century: The Prophetic Writings of Alexander Men*, ed. Roberts, Elizabeth and Ann Shukman, (New York: Continuum, 1996), 151-163.

1.4.12) *Христианство и творчество (Christianity and Creativity),* 05/02/1989.

a) Христианство и творчество - Радостная весть. М.: Вита-центр, 1992.

b) Вера и творчество - Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 54-59.

1.4.13) *О духовности (On Spirituality)*, 08/02/1989.

1.4.14) *Отец Сергей Желудков (Father Sergei Zheludkov),* at an evening in memory of Fr. Zheludkov, 05/03/1989.

a) Отец Сергей Желудков - О себе... М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2007, 181-192.

1.4.15) *Феномен человека: О духовном и нравственном (The Phenomenon of Man:*[994] *About the Spiritual and the Moral),* 'House of Composers', 09/03/1989.

a) Феномен человека: О духовном и нравственном – Почему нам трудно поверить в Бога? М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2005.

b) Феномен человека: О духовном и нравственном – Почему нам трудно поверить в Бога? М.:Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 129-144.

1.4.16) *Библия и апокрифы древности и средневековья (The Bible and Apocryphal Literature from Antiquity and the Middle Ages),* 19/03/1989.

a) Библия и апокрифы древности и средневековья – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1995.

b) Библия и апокрифы древности и средневековья – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1997.

c) Библия и апокрифы древности и средневековья – Библия и литература. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002.

d) Библия и апокрифы древности и средневековья – Библия и литература. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, 7-35.

1.4.17) *Великий пост (Lent),* 01/04/1989.

a) Великий пост - Радостная весть. М.: Вита-центр, 1992.

[994] This translation of the title follows the standard English title of the book by Teilhard de Chardin, for which Men had the greatest respect.

1.4.18) *Пасха (Easter),* 02/05/1989.

a) Пасха - Радостная весть. М.: Вита-центр, 1992.

1.4.19) *Дух и творчество (The Spirit and Creativity),* Music School No. 76, Spring 1989.

1.4.20) *Евангелие – это Слово Жизни (The Gospel is the Word of Life),* 30/06/1989.

a) Евангелие – это Слово Жизни – Русская мысль, 01/02/1991, 3.

b) О вечном и временном. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2007, 7-8. (excerpt)

1.4.21) *Вечные вопросы (Eternal Questions),* lecture on NTV 'First Programme', 06/11/1989.[995]

a) Вечные вопросы - Тайна жизни и смерти. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2003.

b) Вечные вопросы - Тайна жизни и смерти. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008.

1.4.22) *Возникновение ислама (The Rise of Islam),* 09/12/1989.

1.4.23) *Храмовое действо как синтез искусств (The Divine Service as a Synthesis of the Arts),* 19/12/1989.

a) Храмовое действо как синтез искусств - Радостная весть. М.: Вита-центр, 1992.

1.4.24) *Модель библейского понимания личности* (A Model for the Biblical Understanding

[995] Men was forbidden to use the word 'God' during this lecture.

of Personality), Psychology Faculty of Moscow State University, 1989.

1.4.25) A lecture at Moscow Institute of Radio Technology and Electronics, 1989.

1.4.26) *Рождество (Christmas),* 14/01/1990.

a) Рождество - Радостная весть. М.: Вита-центр, 1992.

1.4.27) *О молитве (On Prayer),* 03/02/1990.

a) О молитве - Радостная весть. М.: Вита-центр, 1992.

b) О молитве - Практическое руководство к молитве. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1995.

c) О молитве - Практическое руководство к молитве. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1999.

d) О молитве - Практическое руководство к молитве. (третье изд.) М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002.

e) О молитве - Практическое руководство к молитве. (четвертое изд.) М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 105-126.

f) 'On Prayer', *An Inner Step Toward God: Writings and Teachings on Prayer by Father Alexander Men,* trans. Christa Belyaeva, ed. April French (Brewster MA: Paraclete Press, 2014), 20-34.

1.4.28) *о. Сергей Булгаков (Fr. Sergei Bulgakov),* 20/02/1990.

1.4.29) A lecture at the opening of a Music School, Pushkino, Holy Week 1990.

1.4.30) *Христианство и империя (Christianity and the Empire),* 29/04/1990.

a) Христианство и империя - Христианос VIII, 1999.

1.4.31) A lecture at a Bible Conference, Institute of Oriental Studies, 05/06/1990.

1.4.32) *Христианство (Christianity),* 08/09/1990. Related works: (i) lecture cycle *World Spiritual Culture.*

a) Христианство – Русская мысль 19/10/1990, №3850, 3-4.

b) Христианство – Литературное обозрение 1990, №11, 11-14.

c) Христианство – Литературная газета 19/12/1990, №51, 5.

d) Христианство – Литературная газета , №41 (приложение), 9-16.

e) Христианство - Радостная весть. М.: Вита-центр, 1992.

f) Христианство - Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 11-25.

g) 'Christianity for the Twenty-First Century', *Christianity for the Twenty-First Century: The Prophetic Writings of Alexander Men*, ed. Roberts, Elizabeth and Ann Shukman, (New York: Continuum, 1996), 179-192.

h) Христианство - Мировая духовная культура, лекции. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002.

i) Христианство - Мировая духовная культура, лекции. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2005.

j) Христианство - Мировая духовная культура, лекции. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2016, 243-271.

1.4.33) *Библия и древнерусская литература (The Bible and Old Russian Literature),* date unknown.

a) Библия и древнерусская литература - Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво,

1992, 156-165.

b) Библия и древнерусская литература – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1995.

c) Библия и древнерусская литература – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1997.

d) Библия и древнерусская литература – Библия и литература. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002.

e) Библия и древнерусская литература – Библия и литература. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, 36-69.

1.4.34) *Библия и русская литература XVIII века (The Bible and Russian Literature of the 18th Century),* date unknown.

a) Библия и русская литература XVIII века - Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 165-181.

b) Библия и русская литература XVIII века – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1995.

c) Библия и русская литература XVIII века – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1997.

d) Библия и русская литература XVIII века – Библия и литература. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002.

e) Библия и русская литература XVIII века – Библия и литература. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, 94-132.

1.4.35) *О духовном целительстве (About Spiritual Healing),* date unknown.[996]

a) О духовном целительстве - Радостная весть. М.: Вита-центр, 1992.

[996] Alexander Men Foundation claims this lecture was given in November 1990, which cannot be correct for obvious reasons. See http://www.alexandrmen.ru [01/05/18].

b) О духовном целительстве - Магия, Оккультизм, Христианство. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1996, 149-156.

c) О духовном целительстве - Радость служения. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2013, 93-121.

1.4.36) *Зарождение религиозного сознание (The Dawn of Religious Consciousness),* date unknown, given at the theatre *Na Doskakh*.

a) У истоков духовности - Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 59-62.

b) У истоков - Магия, Оккультизм, Христианство. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1996, 9-11.

1.4.37) *Библия и литература XVII века (The Bible and Literature of the 17th Century),* date unknown.

a) Библия и литература XVII века – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1995.

b) Библия и литература XVII века – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1997.

c) Библия и литература XVII века – Библия и литература. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002.

d) Библия и литература XVII века – Библия и литература. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, 70-93.

1.4.38) *Библия и западная литература XIX века (The Bible and Western Literature of the 19th Century)*, date unknown.

a) Библия и западная литература XIX века – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1995.

b) Библия и западная литература XIX века – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1997.

c) Библия и западная литература XIX века – Библия и литература. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002.

d) Библия и западная литература XIX века – Библия и литература. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, 194-223.

1.4.39) *Духовность человека (The Spirituality of a Human),* date unknown.

1.4.40) A lecture at a Music School, Sokolniki, date unknown.

1.4.41) *Слово Библии (The Word of the Bible),* Moscow State Historical Archiving Institute, date unknown.

1.4.42) *Структура Библии (The Structure of the Bible),* School No. 67, date unknown.

1.4.43) A presentation at an evening dedicated to Tamara Zhirmunskaya, date unknown.

1.4.44) *О культуре мифа (On the Culture of Myth),* date unknown.

Lecture Cycles (69 lectures)

1.4.45) *Библейская история (Biblical History),* a cycle of 8 lectures: (i) *Шестоднев (The Six Days),* 19/01/1989; (ii) *Пролог книги Бытия, Грехопадение (The Prologue to the Book*

of Genesis, The Fall), 11/02/1989; (iii) *Книга надежды, Пророки (Book of Hope, The Prophets),* 25/02/1989; (iv) *Два завета (Two Covenants),* 11/03/1989; (v) *Благая Весть (The Good News),* 11/04/1989; (vi) *Деяния апостолов (The Acts of the Apostles),* 08/05/1989; (vii) *Апостол Павел (The Apostle Paul),* 12/05/1989; (viii) *Апокалипсис (The Apocalypse),* 03/06/1989.

a) Пролог книги Бытия (Грехопадение), Книга надежды (Пророки), Благая Весть – Знамя, 1991, №9, 182-201.

b) Книга надежды (Пророки) - Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 118-134.

c) Благая Весть - Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 135-140.

d) Библейская история - Радостная весть. М.: Вита-центр, 1992.

e) Благая Весть – Русская мысль, 16-22/04/1993, №3975, 17. (abridged)

f) Апокалипсис – Перед рассветом, 1995, №3-4, 41-49.

g) Апокалипсис - Читая апокалипсис. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2007.

h) Апокалипсис - Читая апокалипсис. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011, 235-248.

i) Книга надежды. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011.

1.4.46) *Библия и русская литература XIX века (The Bible and Russian Literature of the 19th Century),* a cycle of 2 lectures: (i) 04/06/1989; (ii) date unknown.

a) Библия и русская литература XIX века - Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 181-200.

b) Пушкин – Книжное обозрение, 05/06/1992, №23 (1257), 3.

c) Библия и русская литература XIX века – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1995.

d) Библия и русская литература XIX века – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1997.

e) Библия и русская литература XIX века – Библия и литература. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002.

f) Библия и русская литература XIX века – Библия и литература. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, 133-193.

1.4.47) *Библия и русская литература XX века (The Bible and Russian Literature of the 20th Century),* a cycle of 3 lectures, dates unknown.

a) Библия и русская литература XX века - Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 200-216. (first lecture only)

b) Библия и русская литература XX века – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1995.

c) Библия и русская литература XX века – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1997.

d) Библия и русская литература XX века – Библия и литература. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002.

e) Библия и русская литература XX века – Библия и литература. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, 224-360.

1.4.48) *Никео-Цареградский «Символ веры» (The Nicaeo-Constantinopolitan Symbol of Faith),* a cycle of 6 lectures from 10/10/1989 to 16/12/1989 at House of Culture “Dukat”. Related works: (I) it is distinct from (1.4.52).

a) Никео-Цареградский «Символ веры» - Радостная весть. М.: Вита-центр, 1992.

b) Жизнь будущего века - Магия, Оккультизм, Христианство. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1996, 93-97. (excerpt from sixth lecture)

1.4.49) *Пути Церкви (Ways of the Church),* a cycle of 10 lectures, 1989 – 1990: (i) *Тайна*

Евангелия (The Mystery of the Gospel), 18/03/1990; (ii) *Павел Тарсянин и его эпоха (Paul of Tarsus and his Epoch),* 10/04/1990; (iii) *Начало христианской Церкви (The Beginning of the Christian Church),* 27/04/1990; (iv) *Становление христианства в первые века (The Development of Christianity in the First Centuries),* 29/04/1990; (v) *Ранее христианство (Early Christianity),* 07/10/1989; (vi) *Апологеты и мученики (Apologetes and Martyrs),* 14/10/1989; (vii) *Империя и христианство (The Empire and Christianity),* 28/10/1989; (viii) *Отцы Церкви и ереси. VI век (Fathers of the Church and the Heresies of the 6th Century),* 03/12/1989; (ix) *Церковь в VII – VIII веках (The Church in the 7th-8th Centuries)*; x) *Христианизация славянских стран. IX – X вв. (The Christianisation of Slavonic Countries in the 9th-10th Centuries)*.

a) Пути Церкви. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2013.

b) История религии: Исторические пути Христианства. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2015. (excerpts)

1.4.50) *Жизнь после жизни (Life after Life),* a cycle of 3 lectures: (i) *Бессмертие души (The Immortality of the Soul),* 08/12/1989; (ii) *Перевоплощение и оккультизм (Reincarnation and Occultism),* 09/02/1990; (iii) *Воскресение мертвых (The Resurrection of the Dead),* 20/02/1990.

a) Перевоплощение и оккультизм – Знание-Сила, 1992, №3, 56-64.

b) Тайна жизни и смерти. М.: Знание, 1992.

c) Тайна жизни и смерти. Культура и религия, 1992, №1.

d) Стрела, запущенная в вечность - Магия, Оккультизм, Христианство. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1996, 84-92. (excerpt from first lecture)

e) Перевоплощение и оккультизм - Магия, Оккультизм, Христианство. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1996, 118-128. (excerpt from second lecture)

f) Воскресение мертвых - Магия, Оккультизм, Христианство. М.: Фонд имени Александра

Меня, 1996, 98-104. (excerpt from third lecture)

g) Тайна жизни и смерти. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2003.

h) Тайна жизни и смерти. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008.

1.4.51) *Русская религиозная философия (Russian Religious Philosophy),* a cycle of 11 lectures, Winter 1988-1989:[997] (i) *Предшественники Владимира Соловьева (The Predecessors of Vladimir Solov'ev)*; (ii) *Владимир Соловьев (Vladimir Solov'ev)*; (iii) *Сергей и Евгений Трубецкие (Sergei and Evgenii Trubetskoi)*; (iv) *Религиозно-философские взгляды Льва Толстого (The Religious-Philosophical views of Lev Tolstoy)*; (v) *Дмитрий Мережковский и Зинаида Гиппиус (Dmitrii Merezhkovskii and Zinaida Gippius)*; (vi) *Николай Бердяев (Nikolai Berdyaev)*; (vii) *Отец Сергий Булгаков (Fr. Sergii Bulgakov)*; (viii) *Отец Павел Флоренский (Fr. Pavel Florensky)*; (ix) *Семен Франк (Semen Frank)*; (x) *Георгий Федотов (Georgii Fedotov)*; (xi) *Мать Мария (Mother Maria)*. Related works: (i) *Encounter* is not a lecture, but an article (1.2.65).

a) Владимир Соловьев – Сегодня, 22/01/1994, №13 (120), 11.

b) Подвижники русской мысли – Вышгород, 1994, №1, 102-112.

c) Предшественники Владимира Соловьева - Русская мысль 09/1994 №4042, 16-17.

d) Владимир Соловьев - Русская мысль 13-19/10/1994, №4048, 16.

e) Николай Бердяев - Русская мысль 27/10-02/11/1994, №4050, 16; 03-09/11/1994, №4051, 16-17.

f) Дмитрий Мережковский и Зинаида Гиппиус - Русская мысль 08-14/12/1994, №4055, 17; 15-21/12/1994, №4056, 17.

g) Русская религиозная философия – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1995.

h) Русская религиозная философия – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская

[997] Daniel, Wallace, *Russia's Uncommon Prophet*, 255.

ярмарка, 1997.

i) Русская религиозная философия. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2003.

j) Русская религиозная философия. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008.

k) *Russian Religious Philosophy: 1989-1990 Lectures,* trans. Stephen Janos, (Mohrsville PA.: FRSJ Publications, 2015).

1.4.52) *Никео-Цареградский Символ (The Nicaeo-Constantinopolitan Symbol),* a cycle of 7 lectures from 17/01/1990 at Russian State Library of Foreign Literature from 17/01/1990. Related works: (I) it is distinct from (1.4.48).

a) Немного солнца – Россия, 04/04/1995, №7 (221). (excerpt from first lecture)

b) Никео-Цареградский Символ – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1995.

c) Никео-Цареградский Символ – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1997.

d) *Seven Talks on the Creed*, trans. Colin Masica and Olga Trubetskoy, (Crestwood NY: SVS Press, 1999).

e) Верую... Беседы о Символе Веры. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2001.

f) Верую... Беседы о Символе Веры. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2007.

g) Верую... Беседы о Символе Веры. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011.

1.4.53) *От рабства к свободе: Ветхий Завет (From Slavery to Freedom: The Old Testament),* a cycle of 11 lectures, Moscow State Historical-Archiving Institute, Spring 1990: (i) *Книга Исхода (The Book of Exodus)*; (ii) *Закон и этика Ветхого Завета (The Law and Ethics of the Old Testament)*; (iii) *Метрические книги Ветхого Завета: лекция I (The Poetic Books of the Old Testament: first lecture)*; (iv) *Метрические книги Ветхого Завета: лекция II (The Poetic Books of the Old Testament: second lecture)*; (v) *Пророки,*

Профетизм (Prophets and Prophetism); (vi) *Книги Исаии, Софонии, Наума, Аввакума, Иеремия (The Books of Isaiah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habbakuk and Jeremiah)*; (vii) *Учительные книги (Pedagogical Books)*; (viii) *Книга Иова и Книга Экклесиаста (The Book of Job and the Book of Ecclesiastes)*; (ix) *Псалтирь (The Psalter)*; (x) *Эсхатология Ветхого Завета (The Eschatology of the Old Testament)*; (xi) *Введение в Новый Завет (An Introduction to the New Testament)*.

a) От рабства к свободе. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008.

1.4.54) *Мировая духовная культура (World Spiritual Culture),* a cycle of 7 lectures, 1990: (i) *Истоки мировой духовной культуры (The Wellsprings of World Spiritual Culture)*; (ii) *Духовные искания Азии (The Spiritual Searching of Asia)*; (iii) *Духовная революция на Востоке. Китай (Spiritual Revolution in the East: China)*; (iv) *Брахманизм. Буддизм. Кришнаизм (Brahmanism, Buddhism, Krishnaism)*; (v) *Досократовская философия (Pre-Socratic Philosophy)*; (vi) *Сократ. Платон. Аристотель (Socrates, Plato, Aristotle)*; (vii) *На пороге Нового Завета (On the Threshold of the New Covenant)*. Related works: (i) lecture *Christianity* (08/09/1990).[998]

a) Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1995.

b) Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1997.

c) Мировая духовная культура, лекции. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002.

d) Мировая духовная культура, лекции. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2005.

e) Мировая духовная культура, лекции. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2016.

[998] This may be considered the final lecture of the series, making it an 8 lecture cycle. See Lukasevicius, Arturas, *Aleksandr Men''s Approach to the World's Religions: A Critical Evaluation in Light of the Declaration Dominus Iesus,* (Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller, 2007), 43. It has usually been published separately, however.

Collections of Questions and Answers following Lectures[999]

1.4.55)

a) Александр Мень отвечает на вопросы. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008.

b) Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусскво, 1992, 66-69, 140-144, 278-280, 351-352, 469-470.

c) Магия, Оккультизм, Христианство. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1996, 157-170.

d) Мы все солидарны в добре и зле – Куранти, 09/09/1994, №938, 6.

e) Почему нам трудно поверить в Бога? М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 151.

f) Символ. (date unknown, see www.alexandermen.ru)

[999] A number of other, untitled collections may be found at http://www.alexandermen.ru.

1.5) *Besedy*[1000]

1.5.1) *О посмертии (On Life After Death),* 2 *besedy*, date unknown.

a) О посмертии - Тайна жизни и смерти. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2003. (second *beseda* only)

b) О посмертии - Тайна жизни и смерти. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008. (second *beseda* only)

1.5.2) *Почему мне трудно поверить в Бога? (Why is it Hard for Me to Believe in God?),* 'round-table' debate, 1970s?

a) Почему мне трудно поверить в Бога? - Россия 11/09/1991, №36 (44).

b) Почему нам трудно поверить в Бога? - Почему нам трудно поверить в Вода? М: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2005, 7-94.

c) Почему нам трудно поверить в Бога? - Почему нам трудно поверить в Вода? М: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 7-94.

1.5.3) *Откровение Иоанна Богослова (The Revelation of John the Theologian),* series of *besedy*, date unknown.

a) Откровение Иоанна Богослова: Комментарии – Знание-Сила, 1991, №9, 43-90.

b) Откровение Иоанна Богослова: Комментарии [ред. Н. Большакова] – Рига: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1992.

c) Читая апокалипсис: Беседы об Откровении святого Иоанна Богослова – М.: Фонд имени

[1000] The Russian term *besedy* is usually translated 'conversation' or 'discourse'. Here the term essentially refers to informal lectures given in private settings, with occasional interjections from Men's parishioners. As with the lectures, and sermons, these were recorded on tape and then later written down and published. Titles are also often later additions, therefore should be seen as provisional.

Александра Меня, 2000.

d) Читая апокалипсис – М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2005.

e) Читая апокалипсис – М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2007.

f) Читая апокалипсис – М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011.

1.5.4) *Беседы на символ веры (Besedy on the Symbol of Faith)*, 9 *besedy*, late 1970s. Key dates: (i) 1980 – incorporated into *Sacrament, Word, Image* as Sixth Chapter. Related works: (I) *Sacrament, Word, Image,* (1.1.4).

a) Беседы на символ веры - Таинство, слово, и образ. О православном богослужении. Брюссель: La Vie avec Dieu, 1980.

b) Беседы на символ веры – Мир библии. М.: Книжная палата, 1990.

c) Беседы на символ веры - Таинство, слово, и образ. О православном богослужении. Ленинград: Ферро-Логас, 1991.

d) Беседы на символ веры - Таинство, слово, и образ. О православном богослужении. М.: Слово, 1991.

e) «Чаю воскресения мертвых и жизни будущего века» - Искусство кино, 1991, №10, 32-36.

f) *Orthodox Worship: Sacrament, Word, Image,* trans. Colin Masica, (Crestwood NY: SVS Press, 1999).

g) Беседы на символ веры - Таинство, слово, и образ. О православном богослужении. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2001.

h) Беседы на символ веры - Таинство, слово, и образ. О православном богослужении. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2007.

1.5.5) *Роль Церкви в современном мире (The Role of the Church in the Modern World)*, late 1970s or early 1980s.

a) Роль Церкви в современном мире – Сегодня, 10/09/1994, 11.

b) Роль Церкви в современном мире – Домашние беседы о Христе и Церкви. М.: Яхцмен, 1995.

c) Роль Церкви в современном мире – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1995.

d) 'The Role of the Church in the Modern World', *About Christ and The Church,* trans. Alexis Vinogradov (Torrance CA.: Oakwood, 1996), 55-66.

e) Роль Церкви в современном мире – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1997.

f) Роль Церкви в современном мире – О Христе и Церкви. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002.

g) Роль Церкви в современном мире – О Христе и Церкви. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2010, 73-92.

1.5.6) *Надлежит быть разномыслию*[1001] *(There should be Differences of Opinion among You),* late 1970s or early 1980s.

a) Атеизм – дар Божий – Куранти, 21/01/1995, 3. (excerpt)

b) Надлежит быть разномыслию – Домашние беседы о Христе и Церкви. М.: Яхцмен, 1995.

c) Надлежит быть разномыслию – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1995.

d) 'There should be differences of opinion among you', *About Christ and The Church,* trans. Alexis Vinogradov (Torrance CA.: Oakwood, 1996), 25-40.

e) Надлежит быть разномыслию – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1997.

f) Надлежит быть разномыслию – О Христе и Церкви. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002.

g) Надлежит быть разномыслию – О Христе и Церкви. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2010, 43-72.

[1001] 1 Corinthians 11:19.

1.5.7) *Церковь в истории (The Church in History),* late 1970s or early 1980s.

a) От Александра, богослова – Российская газета, 21/01/1995. (excerpt)

b) Церковь в истории – Домашние беседы о Христе и Церкви. М.: Яхцмен, 1995.

c) Церковь в истории – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1995.

d) 'The Church in History', *About Christ and The Church,* trans. Alexis Vinogradov (Torrance CA.: Oakwood, 1996), 13-24.

e) Церковь в истории – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1997.

f) Церковь в истории – О Христе и Церкви. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002.

g) Церковь в истории – О Христе и Церкви. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2010, 21-42.

1.5.8) *О добре и зле (On Good and Evil),* date unknown.

a) О добре и зле - Тайна жизни и смерти. М.: Знание, 1992.

b) О добре и зле – Культура и религия №1, 1992.

c) О добре и зле – Радостная весть, М.: Вита-центр, 1992.

d) О добре и зле – Магия, Оккультизм, Христианство. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1996, 177-187.

e) О добре и зле – Радость служения, М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2013, 273-295.

1.5.9) *О внутреннем шаге (An Inner Step),*[1002] late 1970s or early 1980s. Related works: (i) not originally included by Men in *A Practical Guide to Prayer* (1.1.6).

a) О внутреннем шаге – Домашние беседы о Христе и Церкви. М.: Яхцмен, 1995.

[1002] This translation of the title is used for *An Inner Step Toward God: Writings and Teachings on Prayer by Father Alexander Men,* trans. Christa Belyaeva, ed. April French (Brewster MA: Paraclete Press, 2014), which is a translation of *A Practical Guide to Prayer* (1.1.6). The discourse is included on 13-19 of this volume.

b) О внутреннем шаге – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1995.

c) О внутреннем шаге – Практическое руководство к молитве. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1995.

d) 'An Inner Step', *About Christ and The Church,* trans. Alexis Vinogradov (Torrance CA.: Oakwood, 1996), 105-111.

e) О внутреннем шаге – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1997.

f) О внутреннем шаге – Практическое руководство к молитве. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1999.

g) О внутреннем шаге – О Христе и Церкви. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002.

h) О внутреннем шаге – Практическое руководство к молитве. (третье изд.) М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002.

i) О внутреннем шаге – Практическое руководство к молитве. (четвертое изд.) М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008.

j) О внутреннем шаге – О Христе и Церкви. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2010, 123-136.

k) 'An Inner Step', *An Inner Step Toward God: Writings and Teachings on Prayer by Father Alexander Men,* trans. Christa Belyaeva, ed. April French (Brewster MA: Paraclete Press, 2014), 13-19.

1.5.10) *Сказка о происхождении человека: Сказка об уроде (A Tale About the Origins of Humanity: A Tale about Ugly)*, date unknown.

a) Сказка о происхождении человека: Сказка об уроде. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1994.

b) Сказка о происхождении человека: Сказка об уроде. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2007.

c) Сказка о происхождении человека. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2016.

1.5.11) *Человечество Иисуса (The Humanity of Jesus),* late 1970s or early 1980s.

a) Человечество Иисуса – Домашние беседы о Христе и Церкви. М.: Яхцмен, 1995.

b) Человечество Иисуса – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1995.

c) 'The Humanity of Jesus', *About Christ and The Church,* trans. Alexis Vinogradov (Torrance CA.: Oakwood, 1996), 41-48.

d) Человечество Иисуса – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1997.

e) Человечество Иисуса – О Христе и Церкви. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002.

f) Человечество Иисуса – О Христе и Церкви. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2010, 155-174.

1.5.12) *Жизнь в Церкви (Life in the Church),* late 1970s or early 1980s.

a) Жизнь в Церкви – Домашние беседы о Христе и Церкви. М.: Яхцмен, 1995.

b) Жизнь в Церкви – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1995.

c) 'Life in the Church', *About Christ and The Church,* trans. Alexis Vinogradov (Torrance CA.: Oakwood, 1996), 49-54.

d) Жизнь в Церкви – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1997.

e) Жизнь в Церкви – О Христе и Церкви. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002.

f) Жизнь в Церкви – О Христе и Церкви. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2010, 111-122.

1.5.13) *Пасхальная тайна Церкви (The Paschal Mystery of the Church),* late 1970s or early 1980s.

a) Пасхальная тайна Церкви – Домашние беседы о Христе и Церкви. М.: Яхцмен, 1995.

b) Пасхальная тайна Церкви – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1995.

c) 'The Paschal Mystery of the Church', *About Christ and The Church,* trans. Alexis Vinogradov (Torrance CA.: Oakwood, 1996), 67-76.

d) Пасхальная тайна Церкви – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1997.

e) Пасхальная тайна Церкви – О Христе и Церкви. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002.

f) Пасхальная тайна Церкви – О Христе и Церкви. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2010, 175-191.

1.5.14) *Власть Церкви (The Authority of the Church),* late 1970s or early 1980s.

a) Власть Церкви – Домашние беседы о Христе и Церкви. М.: Яхцмен, 1995.

b) Власть Церкви – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1995.

c) 'The Authority of the Church', *About Christ and The Church,* trans. Alexis Vinogradov (Torrance CA.: Oakwood, 1996), 77-86.

d) Власть Церкви – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1997.

e) Власть Церкви – О Христе и Церкви. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002.

f) Власть Церкви – О Христе и Церкви. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2010, 93-110.

1.5.15) *Беседа об искуплении (Beseda on Redemption),* late 1970s or early 1980s.

a) Беседа об искуплении – Домашние беседы о Христе и Церкви. М.: Яхцмен, 1995.

b) Беседа об искуплении – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1995.

c) 'On Redemption', *About Christ and The Church,* trans. Alexis Vinogradov (Torrance CA.: Oakwood, 1996), 87-96.

d) Беседа об искуплении – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1997.

e) Беседа об искуплении – О Христе и Церкви. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002.

f) Беседа об искуплении – О Христе и Церкви. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2010, 137-154.

1.5.16) *Встреча с Христом воскресшим (An Encounter with the Resurrected Christ),* late 1970s or early 1980s.

a) Встреча с Христом воскресшим – Домашние беседы о Христе и Церкви. М.: Яхцмен, 1995.

b) Встреча с Христом воскресшим – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1995.

c) 'An Encounter with the Risen Christ', *About Christ and The Church,* trans. Alexis Vinogradov (Torrance CA.: Oakwood, 1996), 97-104.

d) Встреча с Христом воскресшим – Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1997.

e) Встреча с Христом воскресшим – О Христе и Церкви. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002.

f) Встреча с Христом воскресшим – О Христе и Церкви. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2010, 7-20.

1.5.17) *Человек, Вселенная, Творец: Основы христианской веры (The Human, the Universe, the Creator: The Basics of Christian Faith),* Spring 1980.

a) Человек, Вселенная, Творец: Основы христианской веры - Почему нам трудно поверить в Вода? М: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2005, 95-117.

b) Человек, Вселенная, Творец: Основы христианской веры - Почему нам трудно поверить в Вода? М: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 95-117.

1.5.18) *От Ветхого Завета к Новому (From the Old Covenant to the New)*, date unknown.

a) От Ветхого Завета к Новому - Почему нам трудно поверить в Вода? М: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2005, 118-128.

b) От Ветхого Завета к Новому - Почему нам трудно поверить в Вода? М: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 118-128.

1.5.19) *Открытие восресной школы (The Opening of a Sunday School),* brief talk for the opening of a Sunday School in Novaya Derevnya, 02/09/1990.

a) Открытие восресной школы - Тайна жизни и смерти. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2003.

b) Открытие восресной школы - Тайна жизни и смерти. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008.

1.5.20) *Найти то, что мы потеряли (Let Us Find What We have Lost),* 30/07/1989.

a) Найти то, что мы потеряли - Истина и жизнь, 2003, №1, 2-4.

b) Найти то, что мы потеряли - Церковь и мы. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2012, 10-24.

1.5.21) *Тайна возникновения христианства: О Воскресение Христовом (The Mystery of the Occurrence of Christianity: On the Resurrection of Christ),* 1988.

a) Тайна возникновения христианства: О Воскресение Христовом - Церковь и мы. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2012, 25-76.

1.5.22) *Беседа об апостоле Павла (Beseda on the Apostle Paul),* 17/05/1985.

a) Беседа об апостоле Павла - Церковь и мы. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2012, 77-100.

1.5.23) *Церковь и мы (The Church and Us),* date unknown.

a) Церковь и мы - Церковь и мы. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2012, 101-142.

1.5.24) *Православие, Католичество, Протестантизм (Orthodoxy, Catholicism, Protestantism),* date unknown.

a) Православие, Католичество, Протестантизм - Церковь и мы. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2012, 143-166.

1.5.25) *Социальная концепция православия (The Social Conception of Orthodoxy),* 03/10/1987.

a) Социальная концепция православия - Церковь и мы. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2012, 167-183.

1.5.26) *«Сие творите в Мое воспоминание»: О таинстве Евхаристии ("Do this in Memory of Me": On the Mystery of the Eucharist),* date unknown.

a) «Сие творите в Мое воспоминание»: О таинстве Евхаристии - Церковь и мы. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2012, 184-207.

1.5.27) *Сила Церкви есть сила Христова: Беседа о миропомазании (The Power of the Church is the Power of Christ: A Beseda About Confirmation),* date unknown.

a) Сила Церкви есть сила Христова: Беседа о миропомазании - Церковь и мы. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2012, 208-239.

1.5.28) *Беседа после крещения младенца (Beseda After the Baptism of a Child),* 21/11/1982.

a) Беседа после крещения младенца - Церковь и мы. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2012, 240-248.

1.5.29) *Вера и чудеса (Faith and Miracles),* date unknown.

a) Вера и чудеса - Почему нам трудно поверить в Вода? М: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2005, 145-150.

b) Вера и чудеса - Почему нам трудно поверить в Вода? М: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 145-150.

c) Вера и чудеса - Церковь и мы. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2012, 249-255.

1.5.30) *Беседа о Евангелии (Beseda on the Gospel),* date unknown.

a) Беседа о Евангелии - Любить Бога и любить человека: Домашние беседы. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2013, 7-44.

1.5.31) *«Исследуйте Писания...»* ("Study the Scriptures..."), date unknown.

a) «Исследуйте Писания...» - Любить Бога и любить человека: Домашние беседы. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2013, 45-109.

1.5.32) *Любить Бога и любить человека (Love God and Love Humanity),* date unknown.

a) Любить Бога и любить человека - Любить Бога и любить человека: Домашние беседы. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2013, 110-124.

1.5.33) *Беседа о блаженствах (Beseda on Blessings),* date unknown.

a) Беседа о блаженствах - Любить Бога и любить человека: Домашние беседы. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2013, 125-150.

1.5.34) *О вере и благодати (On Faith and Grace),* date unknown.

a) О вере и благодати - Любить Бога и любить человека: Домашние беседы. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2013, 151-169.

1.5.35) *Беседа о спасении (Beseda on Salvation),* date unknown.

a) Беседа о спасении - Любить Бога и любить человека: Домашние беседы. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2013, 170-180.

1.5.36) *Беседа в доме престарелых и инвалидов (Beseda in a Home for the Elderly and Disabled)*, 30/08/1989.

a) Беседа в доме престарелых и инвалидов - Любить Бога и любить человека: Домашние беседы. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2013, 181-202.

1.5.37) *Святые остаются с нами (The Saints Remain with Us),* date unknown.

a) Святые остаются с нами - Любить Бога и любить человека: Домашние беседы. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2013, 203-219.

1.5.38) *Человек – это личность (The Human is a Person),* 18/08/1986.

a) Человек – это личность - Любить Бога и любить человека: Домашние беседы. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2013, 220-238.

1.5.39) *О любви (On Love)*, date unknown.

a) О любви - Любить Бога и любить человека: Домашние беседы. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2013, 239-252.

1.5.40) *О социальной позиции христианина (On the Social Position of a Christian)*, date unknown.

a) О социальной позиции христианина - Радость служения. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2013, 7-20.

1.5.41) *О подражании Христу (On Imitating Christ),* date unknown.

a) О подражании Христу - Радость служения. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2013, 21-25.

1.5.42) *Апостолат мирян (The Lay Apostolate),* date unknown.

a) Апостолат мирян - Радость служения. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2013, 26-31.

1.5.43) *Слово перед крещением (A Word Before Baptism),* date unknown.

a) Слово перед крещением - Радость служения. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2013, 32-51.

1.5.44) *Беседа в больнице (Beseda in a Hospital),* City Hospital No. 15, date unknown.

a) Беседа в больнице - Радость служения. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2013, 52-92.

1.5.45) *Христианин в миру (A Christian in the World),* date unknown.

a) Христианин в миру - Радость служения. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2013, 122-145.

1.5.46) *О религиозном воспитании детей (On the Religious Upbringing of Children),* date unknown.

a) О религиозном воспитании детей - Радость служения. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2013, 200-227.

1.5.47) *Беседа о семье (Beseda on the Family),* date unknown.

a) Беседа о семье - Радость служения. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2013, 228-233.

1.5.48) *Беседы с юношами (Besedy with Young People),* dates unknown.

a) Беседы с юношами - Радость служения. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2013, 234-272.

1.5.49) Three reflections on the nature of love under the title *Фрагменты о любви (Fragments on Love),* two 'answers' to the question 'What is Love?' and a reflection is titled *Послание о любви (Letter on Love),* date unknown. All three have an unknown spoken source.

a) Фрагменты о любви – Сретенье 2, 1990, 9-13.

b) Фрагменты о любви – Чьи мы, 1991, №4, 78-79.

1.5.50) *О Евхаристии (On the Eucharist),* date unknown.

1.5.51) *Об открытой модели христианства* (On the Open Model of Christianity), fragment from an undated discourse.

1.5.52) An undated address to those getting married.

1.5.53) *Беседа после крещения Маши Юровицкой (Beseda after the Baptism of Masha Yurovitskaya),* date unknown.

1.5.54) *Возможно ли иудеохристианство? (Is Judaeo-Christianity Possible?),* 1973?

a) Возможно ли иудеохристианство? - Василенко Л. И. (ред.) В защиту имени отца Александра Меня (сборник статей). М.: 1993.

b) Что такое юдеохристианство? - Континент 95, 1998.

1.5.55) *Наш главный инструмент – душа (Our Main Instrument is the Soul)*, 28/03/1988.

1.5.56) *О Юне Вертман (On Yuna Vertman),* private conversation in Men's home.

a) О Юне Вертман - Вертман Ю. Записи и примечания. М.: 1992, 55-59.

1.5.57) *Беседа при Крещении Кати З. (Beseda at the Baptism of Katya Z.),* 21/11/1982.

1.5.58) *О духовной усталости (On Spiritual Fatigue),* date unknown.

1.5.59) *О современном язычестве (On Modern Paganism),* date unknown.

1.5.60) *О счастье (On Happiness),* date unknown.

1.5.61) *Церковь первых веков (The Church of the First Centuries)*, date unknown.

1.5.62) *Беседа на семинаре по Иринею Лионскому (Beseda at a Seminar on Irenaeus of Lyons),* 21/01/1978.

1.5.63) *Беседа о книге пророка Даниила* (*Beseda on the Book of Daniel),* date unknown.

1.5.64) *Беседа о таинствах (Beseda on the Sacraments),* date unknown.

1.5.65) *О Божией благодати (On Divine Grace),* for a Baptism, 03/05/1983.

1.5.66) *О видах молитвы (On Forms of Prayer),* date unknown.

1.5.67) *О встрече с Богом (On Encounter with God),* for the Baptism of Anna, date unknown.

1.5.68) *О крещении детей (On the Baptism of Children),* date unknown.

1.5.69) *О непорочном зачатии (On the Virgin Birth),* date unknown.

1.5.70) *О проповеди (On the Sermon),* date unknown.

1.5.71) *О радости и отречении (On Joy and Denial),* date unknown.

1.5.72) *Прогресс и НТР – надежда или опасность (Progress and the Scientific-Technical Revolution),* date unknown.

1.5.73) *О царском пути (On the Royal Way),* date unknown.

1.5.74) *О православии, язычестве и фундаментализме (On Orthodoxy, Paganism and Fundamentalism),* fragment, date unknown.

1.5.75) *Слово об А. Д Сахарове (A Word about Andrei Sakharov),* Library of Foreign Literature, Christmas 1990.

1.5.76) *Мрак и свеи: о картине Дали (Darkness and Light: About a Painting of Dali),* date unknown.

1.6) Sermons[1003]

Sermons first published before 09/09/1990

1.6.1) A series of sermons: a) Zacchaeus; b) Abraham; c) Kinship; d) Joseph the Betrothed. Key dates: (I) 1981 - published in *Надежда;* (ii) 1985 (a) was translated into English by Elizabeth Obolensky and published as 'Sermon for Zacchaeus Sunday' in *Sourozh: A Journal of Orthodox Life and Thought*.

a) Проповеди - Надежда (Possev-Verlag, Frankfurt am Main). 1981, *№5,* 117-124.

b) 'Sermon for Zacchaeus Sunday', *Sourozh: A Journal of Orthodox Life and Thought* 19 (1985), 1-3.

Sermons first published posthumously

1.6.2)

a) *Awake to Life! The Easter Cycle,* trans. Marite Sapiets (London: The Bowerdean Press, 1992).

b) *Awake to Life! The Easter Cycle,* trans. Marite Sapiets (Torrance CA.: Oakwood, 1996).

c) Двунадесятые праздники – Восстань, спящий! М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2007.

d) Двунадесятые праздники - Свет во тьме светит. М. Вита-центр, 1991.

e) Исповеди – Проходские вести 14-15.

f) Навстречу Христу – ЖМП, 1991, №1, 51-52.

g) Начало церковного года - Свет во тьме светит. М. Вита-центр, 1991.

h) Недуг неверия - Магия, оккультизм, христианство. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня,

[1003] Sermons differ from *besedy* and lectures in that they given given in the context of a church service.

1996, 188-190.

i) Неизвестные тексты отца Александра - Илюшенко В. И. Отец Александр Мень: Жизнь, смерть, бессмертие. М.: Эксмо книгоноша, 2013, 647-664.

j) Общая исповедь (24/05/1987) – Книжное обозрение, 19/10/1990, 3.

k) О христианстве. Дух и душа – Согласие 10/09/1990, №37 (59), 5.

l) Пасхальный цикл (ред. А. Еремин). М.: РОС Внешторгиздат, 1991.

m) Пасхальный цикл. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002.

n) Пасхальный цикл – Восстань, спящий! М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2007.

o) Пасхальный цикл – Свет во тьме светит. М. Вита-центр, 1991.

p) Праздники в честь Святых и памятные дни – О вечном и временном. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2007.

q) Праздники в честь Святых и памятные дни – Свет во тьме светит. М. Вита-центр, 1991.

r) Природа-икон – Зов, 1991, №29 (353), 1.

s) Проповеди – Символ. (date unknown)

t) Проповеди – Русская мысль, 01/02/1991, 1-3.

u) Проповеди – Тайна жизни и смерти. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008.

v) Проповеди о святых, почитаемых православной церковью – Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусство, 1992, 152-156.

w) Проповеди по Евангельским чтениям (ред. А. Еремин). М.: Г.И.С., 1991.

x) Проповеди по Евангельским чтениям – Искусство кино, 1991, №4, 6-9. (three sermons only)

y) Проповеди по Евангельским чтениям – О вечном и временном. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2007.

z) Проповеди по Евангельским чтениям – Свет во тьме светит. М. Вита-центр, 1991.

aa) Прости нас, грешных: Слово перед исповедью. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2004.

ab) Прости нас, грешных: Слово перед исповедью. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2006.

ac) Страшный суд – Невское время 01/01/1991, 3.

ad) Христос перед первосвященником (08/11/1986) – Книжное обозрение, 19/10/1990, 3.

ae) Христос перед первосвященником (08/11/1986) – «Смертию смерть поправ». Минск:

Эридан, 1990.

1.7) Correspondence

Dated Letters, arranged chronologically

1.7.1) A letter from Alexander Men to Patriarch Aleksii I, defending an exegetical position taken with respect to John the Baptist. Key dates: (i) letter from 18/02/1961. Related works: (i) article on John the Baptist (1.2.11).

a) Символ. (date unknown)

1.7.2) 160 letters from Alexander Men to his editor Zoya Maslennikova.[1004] Key dates: (i) letters from 1968 -1990.

a) Масленикова З. А. Жизнь отца Александра Меня. М.: Русслит, 1995.

1.7.3) A letter from Alexander Men to E. N. from 1971, a response to criticism of *Son of Man*. Key dates: (i) letter from 1971. Related works: (I) *Son of Man* (1.1.1).

a) Письмо Е. Н. - О себе... М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2007.

1.7.4) Letters from Alexander Men to Aleksandra Orlovaya-Model′. Key dates: (i) letters from 1972 to 1986.

a) Письма - О себе... М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2007.

[1004] Масленикова, 11. A selection of these are embedded in her book.

b) Письма – Христианос 2005, *XIV*, 78-134.

1.7.5) Letters from Alexander Men to the iconographer Sister Ioanna Reitlinger. Key dates: (i) letters from 1974 to 1987.

a) Письма – Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусство, 1992, 64-66.

b) Письма – О себе... М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2007.

c) Будем растить крылья духа – Илюшенко В. И. Отец Александр Мень: Жизнь, смерть, бессмертие. М.: Эксмо книгоноша, 2013, 534-636.

d) Умное небо: Переписка протоиерея Александра Меня с монахиней Иоанной (Ю.Н. Рейтлингер). М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002.

e) Умное небо: Переписка протоиерея Александра Меня с монахиней Иоанной (Ю.Н. Рейтлингер). М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008.

1.7.6) Correspondence between Alexander Men and the nun Viktorina of the Russian mission in Jerusalem (Moscow Patriarchate). Key dates: (i) letters from 1974.

a) Переписка прот. Александра Меня с православной монахиней Викториной Рожко – Из современных проблем Церкви: фрагменты частной переписки о. Александра Меня. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2004, 150-169.

1.7.7) Correspondence between V. Roshko and Alexander Men. Key dates: (i) letters from 1974-1975; (ii) from 1975 - circulated in *samizdat.*

a) (untitled) – Самиздат. Машинопись, 1975.

b) Из писем другу на Западе – Куранти 10/09/1991, №169 (184), 6.

c) Из писем другу на Западе – Вестник РХД, II.1992, №165, 44-73.

d) Переписка прот. Александра Меня с о. Всеволодом Рожко – Из современных проблем Церкви: фрагменты частной переписки о. Александра Меня. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2004, 10-149.

1.7.8) Two Letters from Correspondent Z (Alexander Men) to Sergei Zheludkov and K. A. Lyubarskii. Key dates: (i) letters from 27.9.1974 and Nov. 1975; (ii) 1982 – published in collection *Christianity and Atheism* by La Vie avec Dieu.

a) Два письма от Корреспондента З. Сергею Желудкову и К. А. Любарскому – Желудков, Сергей и К. А. Любарский. Христианство и атеизм: Переписка о. С. Желудкова с К. А. Любарским. Брюссель: La Vie avec Dieu, 1982, 56-63, 169-173.

1.7.9) Pastoral letters from Alexander Men to an unnamed young woman. Key dates: (i) letters from 1975 to 1985.

a) Письма – Истина и жизнь 1998, №1, 3.
b) Лук стреляет, лишь пока он натянут – Илюшенко В. И. Отец Александр Мень: Жизнь, смерть, бессмертие. М.: Эксмо книгоноша, 2013, 513-533.

1.7.10) Two Letters from Alexander Men to Mikhail Gal′perin. Key dates: (i) letters from 1976 and 1990.

a) Письма – О себе... М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2007.

1.7.11) Letters from Alexander Men to the artist Diana Vinkovetskaya. Key dates: (i) letters from 1977 to 1990.

a) Винковецкая Д. «...Ваш о. Александр». СПб.: Фонд русской поэзии, 1999.

b) Винковецкая Д. «...Ваш о. Александр»: переписка с отцом Александром Менем. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2003.

1.7.12) Letters from Alexander Men to Raisa Kolesnikova. Key dates: (i) letters from 1978 to 1990.

a) Письма – Истина и жизнь, 1997, №9, 4.

b) Письма – О себе... М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2007.

c) Я воспринимаю это время как суд Божий – Илюшенко В. И. Отец Александр Мень: Жизнь, смерть, бессмертие. М.: Эксмо книгоноша, 2013, 491-512.

1.7.13) Letters from Alexander Men to the artist I. Makarova-Vysheslavskaya. Key dates: (i) letters from 1979-1990; (ii) 1990 – excerpt published in *Литературное обозрение*.

a) «Храни Вас Бог...» (ред. В. Ерохин) – Литературное обозрение, 1990, №11, 15-16.

b) Письма – Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусство, 1992, 62-64.

1.7.14) Correspondence between Ioann Shakhovskii and Aleksandr Men, relating to the publication of *Sacrament, Word, and Image*. Key dates: (i) letters from 1979-1980. (ii) 1990 – published in *Вестник РХД.* Related works: (i) *Sacrament, Word, and Image* (1980 edition) (1.1.3).

a) Переписка Александра Меня с И. Шаховским – Вестник РХД, 1990, №160, 3.

1.7.15) Letters from Alexander Men to V. L. Levi. Key dates: (i) letters from c.1984 to 1990.

a) Два письма В. Л. Леви - О себе... М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2007.

1.7.16) *Ответ священнику N (An Answer to Priest N),* also known as *Two Letters to Vladimir Volgin (Sergei Antiminsov).*[1005] Key dates: (i) letters from 01/1984.

a) Ответ священнику N. – «Смертию смерть поправ». Минск: Эридан, 1990.

b) Ответ священнику N. – Русская мысль 13/09/1991, №3895, прилож. III.

c) Приложение 16: Ответ священнику В. В. - Бычков С. С. Хроника нераскрытого убийства. М.: Русское рекламное издательство, 1996.

1.7.17) An 'explanatory note' from Alexander Men to Protopresbyter Anisimov from Zagorsk, a response to a defamatory letter about Men falsely written under the name of Metropolitan Antonii (Mel′nikov).[1006] Key dates: (i) letter from 14/12/1984.

a) Объяснительная записка – О себе... М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2007, 240-249.

b) Объяснительная записка – Символ. (date unknown)

1.7.18) *Поздравление с Рождеством (A Christmas Greeting),* a letter to Men's parishioners circulated on audio cassette, when he was away from his parish. Key dates (i) circulated at Christmas 1987.

1.7.19) A taped response to a letter from Sonya Rukova. Key dates: (i) 06/06/1989 - recorded

[1005] Notes concerning the identity of this individual can be found at http://krotov.info/spravki/1_history_bio/21_bio/volgin_v.html [Accessed 22/04/2018].

[1006] This may be found in the volume Протоиерей Александр Мень как комментатор священного писания. Санкт-Петербург: Общество памяти игумении Таисии, 2006, 68-83.

on cassette.

1.7.20) A Letter from Alexander Men to V. Kupchenko. Key dates: (i) letter from 29/08/1989.

a) Письмо – О себе... М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2007.

1.7.21) A Letter of Alexander Men to N. A. Struve. Key dates: (i) Letter from 08/1990.

a) Письмо Н. А. Струве – Вестник РХД, II.1990, №159, 297.

Undated Letters

1.7.22) An undated letter from Alexander Men to N (Nina). Key dates: (i) 1980s - Men circulated letter among his parishioners to answer questions concerned with ecumenism.

a) Письмо прот. Александра Меня к N. – Из современных проблем Церкви: фрагменты частной переписки о. Александра Меня. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2004, 171-173.

1.7.23) A letter from Alexander Men to Mother Kristos Samra. Key dates: year unknown, although the letter is dated '22nd Aug.'

a) Письмо прот. Александра Меня к Крестосу Самре. – Из современных проблем Церкви: фрагменты частной переписки о. Александра Меня. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня,

2004, 174-176.

1.7.24) A letter entitled ‘A Day in the Life of a Village Priest’, recipient unknown.

a) Один день в жизни деревенского священника – О себе... М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2007.

1.7.25) Three letters from Alexander Men to unnamed parishioners.

a) Три письма – Христианос III, 1994, 81-88.

1.7.26) Letters from Alexander Men to Marianna Vekovaya.

a) Письма – Истина и жизнь №1, 2001.

1.7.27) Two letters from Alexander Men to Vladimir Ivanovich Safonov.

a) Два письма – Невероятное. М.: Физкультура и спорт, 1993.

1.8) Other

Written Materials Intended for Informal Circulation among Men's Parishioners and Friends[1007]

1.8.1) 'Prayers of Alexander Men'

a) Из молитвенного опыта отца Александра - Практическое руководство к молитве. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1995.

b) Из молитвенного опыта отца Александра - Практическое руководство к молитве. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1999.

c) Молитвы о. Александра – Христианос VIII, 1999, 189-193.

d) Из молитвенного опыта отца Александра - Практическое руководство к молитве. (третье изд.) М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002.

e) Благослови молитву мою: Из молитвенного опыта. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2006.

f) Благослови молитву мою: Из молитвенного опыта. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2007.

g) Из молитвенного опыта отца Александра - Практическое руководство к молитве. (четвертое изд.) М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008.

h) *Prayers for Mankind: A Symphony of Prayers of Father Alexander Men* – Alexander Levine. Signum Records UK, SIGCD212. (a choral setting of Men's prayers on disc – prayers printed in booklet in Russian and English)

i) Молитвы о. Александра Меня – Илюшенко В. И. Отец Александр Мень: Жизнь, смерть, бессмертие. М.: Эксмо книгоноша, 2013, 665-670.

j) 'Father Alexander's Public Prayers', *An Inner Step Toward God: Writings and Teachings on*

[1007] Although these were circulated during Alexander Men's lifetime, they were not published until after 1990.

Prayer by Father Alexander Men, trans. Christa Belyaeva, ed. April French (Brewster MA: Paraclete Press, 2014), 105-114.

1.8.2) *Приготовление к исповеди (Preparing for Confession)*, notes for parishioners.

a) Приготовление к исповеди – «Смертию смерть поправ». Минск: Эридан, 1990.

1.8.3) A questionnaire on the spiritual life, for parishioners.

a) Масленикова З. А. Жизнь отца Александра Меня. М.: Русслит, 1995, 482.

1.8.4) Men's answers to Solov′ev's questionnaire.

a) О себе... М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2007, 236-237.

1.8.5) *Правила для молодоженов (Rules for Newlyweds),* notes for parishioners.

1.8.6) *О проведении Великого Поста (On Keeping Lent),* notes for parishioners.

a) О проведении Великого Поста – «Смертию смерть поправ». Минск: Эридан, 1990.

b) О проведении Великого Поста – М.: 1993.

c) О проведении Великого Поста – Практическое руководство к молитве. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1995.

d) О проведении Великого Поста – М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1998.

e) О проведении Великого Поста – Практическое руководство к молитве. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1999.

f) О проведении Великого Поста – Практическое руководство к молитве. (третье изд.) М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002.

g) О проведении Великого Поста – М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2004.

h) О проведении Великого Поста – М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2007.

i) О проведении Великого Поста – Практическое руководство к молитве. (четвертое изд.) М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008.

j) О проведении Великого Поста – М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2011.

k) 'The Observance of Great Lent', *An Inner Step Toward God: Writings and Teachings on Prayer by Father Alexander Men,* trans. Christa Belyaeva, ed. April French (Brewster MA: Paraclete Press, 2014), 81-90..

1.8.7) *Памятка православного христианина (Handbook for the Orthodox Christian),* notes for parishioners.

a) Памятка православного христианина – Практическое руководство к молитве. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1995.

b) Памятка православного христианина – Практическое руководство к молитве. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1999.

c) Памятка православного христианина – Практическое руководство к молитве. (третье изд.) М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002.

d) Памятка православного христианина – Практическое руководство к молитве. (четвертое изд.) М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 21-43.

e) 'Selections from the Handbook for the Orthodox Christian', *An Inner Step Toward God: Writings and Teachings on Prayer by Father Alexander Men,* trans. Christa Belyaeva, ed. April French (Brewster MA: Paraclete Press, 2014), 147-154. (excerpts)

1.8.8) *О проведении Рождественского поста (On Keeping the Christmas Fast)*, notes for

parishioners.

Film and Music

1.8.9) Scenes from film *Любить (To Love),* directed by Mikhail Kalik, Men speaks on the theme of love. Key dates: (i) 1968 – film released and banned.

a) Еремин. А. А. Отец Александр Мень. Пастырь на рубеже веков. М.: «Carte Blanche», 2001, 326. (excerpt only)

1.8.10) Slide films: a) *Свет миру (Light to the World),* 1979; b) *Назаретская Дева (The Young Woman from Nazareth),* 1979; c) *Таина зла (The Mystery of Evil),* date unknown; d) *Апостолы (The Apostles),* 1980s; e) *Франциск Ассизский (Francis of Assisi),* 1983; f) *Человек, вселенная, творец (Humanity, The Universe, The Creator),* 1983; g) Ilyushenko (95, 393) lists others: *Моисей (Moses), Давид (David), Шарль де Фуко (Charles de Foucauld); Откуда все это? (From where did all this come?); Туринская плащаница (The Turin Shroud); Евангелие в образах иконы (The Gospel in Iconographic Images).* Related works: (i) text for (a) printed as an article (1.2.32); (ii) text and imagery for *Откуда все это?* incorporated in *Светь и жизнь (Light and Life)* (1.1.11).

1.8.11) Three Songs for Voice and Guitar, c. 1953-1958.

1.9) General Bibliography for Volumes by Aleksandr Men

1.9.1) *About Christ and the Church,* trans. Fr. Alexis Vinogradov (Torrance CA.: Oakwood, 1995). (see 1.5.5, 1.5.6, 1.5.7, 1.5.9, 1.5.11, 1.5.12, 1.5.13, 1.5.14, 1.5.15, 1.5.16)

1.9.2) *An Inner Step Toward God: Writings and Teachings on Prayer by Father Alexander Men,* trans. Christa Belyaeva, ed. April French (Brewster MA: Paraclete Press, 2014). (see 1.1.6, 1.4.27, 1.5.9, 1.8.1, 1.8.6, 1.8.7)

1.9.3) *Awake to Life! The Easter Cycle,* trans. Marite Sapiets (London, The Bowerdean Press, 1992). (see 1.6.2)

1.9.4) *Christianity for the Twenty-First Century: The Prophetic Writings of Alexander Men,* ed. Roberts, Elizabeth and Ann Shukman, (New York: Continuum, 1996). (see 1.1.2.1, 1.2.36, 1.2.44, 1.2.49, 1.2.52, 1.3.23, 1.3.27, 1.3.29, 1.4.11, 1.4.32)

1.9.5) *Orthodox Worship: Sacrament, Word, Image,* trans. Colin Masica, (Crestwood NY: SVS Press, 1999). (see 1.1.4, 1.5.4)

1.9.6) *Russian Religious Philosophy: 1989-1990 Lectures,* trans. Fr. S. Janos, (frsj publications, Mohrsville PA., 2015). (see 1.2.65, 1.4.51)

1.9.7) *Seven Talks on the Creed*, trans. Colin Masica and Olga Trubetskoy, (Crestwood NY: SVS Press, 1999). (see 1.4.52)

1.9.8) *Son of Man, trans. Samuel Brown,* (Crestwood NY: SVS Press, 1998). (see 1.1.1)

1.9.9) 'The Messianic Eschatology of St. Paul in Connexion with the Primitive Preaching of the

Gospel', ed. A. Vanhoye, *L'apôtre Paul: Personnalité, Style et Conception du Ministère: Extrait,* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1986), 322-3 (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensum 73). (see 1.2.35)

1.9.10) *The Wellsprings of Religion,* trans. Alasdair MacNaughton (New York: SVS Press, 2017). (see 1.1.2.1)

1.9.11) Александр Мень отвечает на вопросы. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008. (see 1.4.55)

1.9.12) Библиологический словарь. Том первый А-Й. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. (see 1.1.8)

1.9.13) Библиологический словарь. Том второй К-П. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. (see 1.1.8)

1.9.14) Библиологический словарь. Том третий Р-Я. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. (see 1.1.8)

1.9.15) Библия – Наше наследия. 1990 №1 https://studfiles.net/preview/2243506 [Accessed 20/06/2018]. (see 1.2.50)

1.9.16) Библия и литература. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. (see 1.2.67, 1.4.16, 1.4.33, 1.4.34, 1.4.37, 1.4.38, 1.4.46, 1.4.47)

1.9.17) Благослови молитву мою: Из молитвенного опыта. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2006. (see 1.8.1)

1.9.18) Верую... Беседы о Символе Веры. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011. (see 1.4.52)

1.9.19) Вестники Царства Божия. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2010. (see 1.1.2.5)

1.9.20) Восстань, спящий! М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2007. (see 1.6.2)

1.9.21) В поисках подлинного Христа – Библия и литература. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, 368-415: https://predanie.ru/book/73194-v-poiskah-podlinnogo-hrista/ [Accessed 21.04.2019]. (see 1.2.67)

1.9.22) Встреча – Русская религиозная философия. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 142-180. (see 1.2.65)

1.9.23) Два письма Владимиру Волгину (http://www.krotov.info/library/13_m/myen/2_1984volg.html [Accessed 20/06/2018]). (see 1.7.16)

1.9.24) Дионис, Логос, Судьба. Греческая религия и философия от эпохи колонизации до Александра. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. (see 1.1.2.4)

1.9.25) Евангелие от Марка: Предисловие к новому переводу В.Н. Кузнецовой – Народы Азии и Африки 1989, 6, 112-4. (see 1.2.39)

1.9.26) Из современных проблем Церкви: фрагменты частной переписки о. Александра Меня. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2004. (see 1.7.6, 1.7.7, 1.7.22, 1.7.23)

1.9.27) Исагогика: Курс по изучению священного писания: Ветхий завет. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2003. (see 1.1.7)

1.9.28) Истоки религии: Природа веры. Человек во Вселенной. Перед лицом Сущего. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011. (see 1.1.2.1)

1.9.29) История религии: В поисках Пути, Истины и Жизни. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1994. (see 1.1.2)

1.9.30) История религии: Исторические пути Христианства. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2015. (see 1.1.3, 1.4.49)

1.9.31) Как читать библию. Часть первая. М: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2005. (see 1.1.5, 1.2.69)

1.9.32) Как читать библию. Часть вторая. М: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2005. (see 1.1.5)

1.9.33) Как читать библию. Часть третья. М: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2005. (see 1.1.5)

1.9.34) Катакомбы XX века. М.: Фонд имени Александпа Меня, 2001.

1.9.35) К истории русской православной библеистики. - Навстречу Христу. М: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. (see 1.2.23)

1.9.36) Книга надежды. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011. (see 1.4.4, 1.4.8, 1.4.9, 1.4.45)

1.9.37) Культура и духовное восхождение. М.: Искусство, 1992. (see 1.2.36, 1.2.37, 1.2.41, 1.2.42, 1.2.43, 1.2.44, 1.2.47, 1.2.49, 1.2.50, 1.2.54, 1.2.55, 1.2.60, 1.2.62, 1.2.65, 1.2.67, 1.2.69, 1.2.74, 1.2.77, 1.2.79, 1.3.3, 1.3.5, 1.3.14, 1.3.16, 1.3.23, 1.3.24, 1.3.25, 1.3.30, 1.4.6, 1.4.12, 1.4.32, 1.4.33, 1.4.34, 1.4.36, 1.4.45, 1.4.46, 1.4.47, 1.4.55, 1.6.2, 1.7.5, 1.7.13)

1.9.38) Любить Бога и любить человека: Домашние беседы. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2013. (see 1.3.11, 1.5.30, 1.5.31, 1.5.32, 1.5.33, 1.5.34, 1.5.35, 1.5.36, 1.5.37, 1.5.38, 1.5.39)

1.9.39) Магизм и единобожие. Религиозный путь человечества до эпохи великих Учителей. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. (see 1.1.2.2)

1.9.40) Магия, оккультизм, христианство. Из книг, лекций и бесед. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1996. (see 1.1.2.1, 1.1.2.2, 1.1.2.3, 1.2.44, 1.2.47, 1.4.35, 1.4.36, 1.4.48, 1.4.50, 1.4.55, 1.6.2)

1.9.41) Мир библии – Как читать библию. Часть первая. М: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2005. (see 1.2.69)

1.9.42) Мировая духовная культура. М.: Нижегородская ярмарка, 1995. (see 1.4.16, 1.4.33, 1.4.34, 1.4.37, 1.4.38, 1.4.46, 1.4.47, 1.4.51, 1.4.52, 1.4.54, 1.5.5, 1.5.6, 1.5.7, 1.5.9, 1.5.11, 1.5.12, 1.5.13, 1.5.14, 1.5.15, 1.5.16)

1.9.43) Мировая духовная культура, лекции. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2016. (see 1.4.32, 1.4.54)

1.9.44) Мрак и свет: https://www.slovosnami.narod.ru/AMen.htm [Accessed 06/04/2019]. (see 1.5.76)

1.9.45) Навстречу Христу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. 309-382. (see 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.2.3, 1.2.4, 1.2.5, 1.2.6, 1.2.7, 1.2.8, 1.2.9, 1.2.10, 1.2.12, 1.2.13, 1.2.14, 1.2.15, 1.2.16, 1.2.17, 1.2.18, 1.2.19, 1.2.20, 1.2.21, 1.2.22, 1.2.23)

1.9.46) На пороге Нового Завета: От эпохи Александра Македонского до проповеди Иоанна Крестителя. Книга I. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011. (see 1.1.2.6)

1.9.47) На пороге Нового Завета: От эпохи Александра Македонского до проповеди Иоанна

Крестителя. Книга II. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011. (see 1.1.2.6)

1.9.48) О библейских пророках – Христианос III. 1994, 89-118. (see 1.2.80)

1.9.49) О вечном и временном. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2007. (see 1.4.20, 1.6.2)

1.9.50) О добре и зле. Http://www.krotov.info/library/13_n/myen/00103.html [Accessed 25/07/17]. (see 1.5.8)

1.9.51) О себе... М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2007. (see 1.1.16, 1.2.55, 1.3.3, 1.3.23, 1.3.25, 1.4.14, 1.7.3, 1.7.4, 1.7.5, 1.7.10, 1.7.12, 1.7.15, 1.7.17, 1.7.20, 1.7.24, 1.8.4)

1.9.52) От рабства к свободе. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008. (see 1.4.53)

1.9.53) О Христе и Церкви. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2010. (see 1.5.5, 1.5.6, 1.5.7, 1.5.9, 1.5.11, 1.5.12, 1.5.13, 1.5.14, 1.5.15, 1.5.16)

1.9.54) Первые Апостолы. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. (see 1.1.3)

1.9.55) Почему нам трудно поверить в Вода? М: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2005 (переизд. 2008). (see 1.4.15, 1.4.55, 1.5.2, 1.5.17, 1.5.18, 1.5.29)

1.9.56) Практическое руководство к молитве. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008. (see 1.1.6, 1.2.33, 1.4.27, 1.5.9, 1.8.1, 1.8.6, 1.8.7)

1.9.57) Прости нас, грешных: Слово перед исповедью. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2004. (see 1.6.2)

1.9.58) Протоиерей Александр Мень – художник. Сергиев Посад: <Дубрава>, 2014.

1.9.59) Пути Церкви. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2013. (see 1.4.49)

1.9.60) Радостная весть. М.: Вита-центр, 1992. (see 1.4.4, 1.4.5, 1.4.6, 1.4.11, 1.4.12, 1.4.17, 1.4.18, 1.4.23, 1.4.26, 1.4.27, 1.4.32, 1.4.35, 1.4.45, 1.4.48)

1.9.61) Радость служения. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2013. (see 1.1.16, 1.3.33, 1.3.34, 1.4.35, 1.5.40, 1.5.41, 1.5.42, 1.5.43, 1.5.44, 1.5.45, 1.5.46, 1.5.47, 1.5.48)

1.9.62) Русская религиозная философия: лекции. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008. (see 1.2.65, 1.4.51)

1.9.63) Свет во тьме светит. М. Вита-центр, 1991. (see 1.6.2)

1.9.64) Свет и жизнь, Брюссель: Жизнь с Богом, 1990. (see 1.1.11)

1.9.65) Свет миру. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2014. (see 1.1.12)

1.9.66) Сказка о происхождении человека. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2016. (see 1.5.10)

1.9.67) «Смертию смерть поправ». Минск: Эридан, 1990. (see 1.2.34, 1.2.36, 1.6.2, 1.7.16, 1.8.2, 1.8.6)

1.9.68) Спаситель. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2005. (see 1.1.13)

1.9.69) Сын человеческий. (седьмое изд.) М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2016. (see 1.1.1)

1.9.70) Тайна жизни и смерти. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008. (see 1.4.21, 1.4.50, 1.5.1, 1.5.19)

1.9.71) Таинство, слово и образ. Ленинград: Ферро-Логас, 1991. (see 1.1.4, 1.5.4, 1.6.2)

1.9.72) Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008. (see 1.2.36, 1.2.40, 1.2.41, 1.2.42, 1.2.43, 1.2.44, 1.2.45, 1.2.47, 1.2.49, 1.2.52, 1.2.54, 1.2.59, 1.2.60, 1.2.65, 1.2.74, 1.2.75, 1.2.76, 1.2.77, 1.2.78, 1.2.79, 1.3.11, 1.3.24, 1.3.29, 1.4.2)

1.9.73) У врат молчания: Духовная жизнь Китая и Индии в середине первого тысячелетия до нашей эры. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. (see 1.1.2.3)

1.9.74) Умное небо: Переписка протоиерея Александра Меня с монахиней Иоанной (Ю.Н. Рейтлингер). М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008. (see 1.7.5)

1.9.75) Христианство и культура, http://yakov.works/library/13_m/myen/00176.htm [Accessed 22/05/2019]. (see 1.4.10)

1.9.76) Христианство и творчество (05.02.1989), https://www.alexandermen.ru [Accessed 01.04.2019]. (see 1.4.12)

1.9.77) Церковь и мы. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2012. (see 1.5.20, 1.5.21, 1.5.22, 1.5.23, 1.5.24, 1.5.25, 1.5.26, 1.5.27, 1.5.28, 1.5.29)

1.9.78) Цветочки Александра Меня. Подлинные истории о жизни доброго пастыря. М.: Издательство АСТ, 2017.

1.9.79) Читая апокалипсис. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011. (see 1.4.45, 1.5.3)

1.9.80) Что такое юдеохристианство? - Континент 95, 1998.

http://www.golubinski.ru/ecclesia/iudeo.htm [Accessed 28/05/2018]. (see 1.5.54)

Bibliography 2: General Bibliography for all Works except those of Aleksandr Men

This is intended primarily as a bibliography for secondary sources, although it also includes all 'Russian school' texts used in the study. Only those texts referred to in the course of preparing the study are listed. They are cross-referenced with 'works' in Bibliography 1.1-8 where they include 'works' by Aleksandr Men.

2.1) «Aequinox». Сборник памяти о. А. Меня. (ред. Вишневецкий И. Г., Рабинович Е. Г.) М.: "Carte Blanche". 1991.

2.2) Alfeev, Ilarion, 'Theology of the Icon in the Orthodox Church'. Lecture at St. Vladimir's Seminary, 5 February 2011. https://mospat.ru/en/2011/02/06/news35783/#_ftn6 [Accessed 19/04/2019].

2.3) Aristotle, *Metaphysics Book XII.* http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/metaphysics.12.xii.html [Accessed 26/05/2019].

2.4) Augustine of Hippo, *City of God,* trans. Dods, Marcus, in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, First Series, Vol. 2,* ed. Schaff, Philip (Buffalo, N. Y: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1887), ed. and republished by Knight, Kevin, *http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/120117.htm* [Accessed 20/06/2018].

2.5) Averintsev, Sergei and Felmy, Karl-Christian, 'Die Russische Theologie seit Peter dem Großen', in Heinz Ohme and Johann Schneider, *Diskos. Glaube, Erfahrung und Kirche in der neuren orthodoxen Theologie. Gesammelte Aufsätze*, *Oikonomia. Quellen und Studien zur orthodoxen Theologie, 41,* Erlangen 2003, 303: "Aleksandr Men war kein im eigentlichen Sinne

schöpferischer Theologe".

2.6) *Biblia Hebraica,* ed. R. Kittell (Stuttgart, 1966).

2.7) Barth, Karl, *The Church Dogmatics Vol. I.2 (§§ 13-24),* trans. Torrance, Thomas, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1956).

2.8) Basil of Caesarea, *Hexaemeron,* http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/32019.htm [Accessed 17/12/2018].

2.9) Batalden, Stephen K., *Russian Bible Wars: Modern Scriptural Translation and Cultural Authority* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013).

2.10) Blackwell, Albert L. *The Sacred in Music,* (Cambridge: The Lutterworth Press, 1999).

2.11) Bohachevsky-Chomiak, Martha, *Sergei N. Trubetskoi: An Intellectual Among the Intelligentsia in Prerevolutionary Russia,* (Belmont, Mass.: Nordland Publishing Company, 1976).

2.12) Bonhoeffer, Dietrich, *Letters and Papers from Prison,* (London: The Folio Society, 2000).

2.13) Bonhoeffer, Dietrich, *Works, Volume 3, Creation and Fall: A Theological Exposition of Genesis 1-3,* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004).

2.14) Borgen, Peder, *Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete for his time,* (Leiden: Brill, 2005).

2.15) Bourdeaux, Michael, *Gorbachev, Glasnost & The Gospel,* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1990).

2.16) Bulgakov, Sergius, *Jacob's Ladder: On Angels,* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010).

2.17) Bulgakov, Sergius, *The Bride of the Lamb* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002).

2.18) Bulgakov, Sergius, *The Burning Bush: On the Orthodox Veneration of the Mother of God,* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009).

2.19) Bulgakov, Sergius, *The Comforter* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004).

2.20) Bulgakov, Sergius, *The Friend of the Bridegroom* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003).

2.21) Bulgakov, Sergius, *The Lamb of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008).

2.22) Bulgakov, Sergius, *Unfading Light: Contemplations and Speculations* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012).

2.23) *Canons of the Seven Ecumenical Councils*, with Foreword by Archbishop Peter L'Huillier, https://www.prophet-elias.com/deutsch/in-english/in-english-1/ [Accessed 24/06/2018].

2.24) Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata 1:18,* http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/02101.htm [Accessed 17/12/2018].

2.25) *Corpus Dionsiacum* 2 vols ed. Beate Regina Suchla, (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990), vol 1.

2.26) Daniel, Wallace L., *Russia's Uncommon Prophet: Father Aleksandr Men and His Times* (DeKalb: NIU Press, 2016).

2.27) Davies, William and Daube, David (eds.), *The Background of the New Testament and Its*

Eschatology, in honour of C.H. Dodd, (Cambridge: CUP, 1956).

2.28) Dawson, Christopher, *Progress and Religion,* (New York and London: Sheed & Ward, 1929).

2.29) Ellingworth, Paul, 'Translation Techniques in Modern Bible Translation', ed. Noss, Philip *A History of Bible Translation,* 307-336.

2.30) Ellis, Jane, *The Russian Orthodox Church: A Contemporary History* (London: Routledge, 1986).

2.31) Evdokimov, Michel, *Fr. Alexander Men: Martyr of Atheism,* trans. Margaret Parry, (Gracewing, Leominster, 2011).

2.32) Evtuhov, Catherine, *The Cross & The Sickle: Sergei Bulgakov and the Fate of Russian Religious Philosophy 1890-1920.* (London: Cornell University Press, 1997).

2.33) Florensky, Pavel, *The Pillar and Ground of the Truth: An Essay in Orthodox Theodicy in Twelve Letters,* trans. Boris Jakim, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004).

2.34) Florovsky, Georges, 'Introduction', Martha Bohachievsky-Chomiak, *S.N. Trubetskoi: An Intellectual among the intelligentsia in Prerevolutionary Russia,* 5-10.

2.35) Forster, Michael, 'Friedrich Daniel Ernst Schleiermacher' (2002, rev.2017) in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2017 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/schleiermacher/#HermIeTheoInte [Accessed 22.04.2019].

2.36) French, April Lynn, 'Spiritual Dissident: The Writings of Father Aleksandr Men as Dissent from Soviet Ideology'. MA thesis, Regent College, Vancouver, BC, 2011.

2.37) Gadamer, Hans-Georg, *Truth and Method* Second, Revised Edition, (London: Continuum, 2004).

2.38) Gitin, Seymour, 'The House that Albright Built', *Near Easterm Archaeology,* 01/03/2002, *65(1),* 5-10.

2.39) Gregory of Nazianzus, *On God and Christ: the five theological orations and two letters to Cledonius,* ed. Frederick Williams and Lionel Wickham, (Crestwood: SVS, 2002).

2.40) Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Making of Man* 16, http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/2914.htm [Accessed 17/12/18].

2.41) Hamant, Yves, *Alexander Men: A Witness for Contemporary Russia (A Man for Our Times),* trans. Fr. Steven Bigham, (Oakwood, Torrance, CA, 1995).

2.42) Harnack, Adolf von, *Marcion: das Evangelium vom fremden Gott,* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1921).

2.43) Harnack, Adolf von, *Outlines of the History of Dogma,* (New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1893).

2.44) Harnack, Adolf von, *The Meaning of Christianity,* http://www.ccel.org/ccel/harnack/christianity.iii.ii.html [Accessed 01/11/2018].

2.45) Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich, *Phenomenology of Spirit,* trans. Findlay J. N., (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977).

2.46) Heidegger, Martin, *Being and Time,* translated Joan Stambaugh, (Albany NY: State University of New York Press, 2010).

2.47) Heis, Jeremy, 'Neo-Kantianism', *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2018 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.) at https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2018/entries/neo-kantianism/ [Accessed 18/04/2019].

2.48) St. Jerome, *Commentary on Isaiah: including St. Jerome's translation of Origen's homilies 1-9 on Isaiah,* trans. Thomas P. Scheck (New York: Newman Press, 2015).

2.49) Komaromi, Ann, 'Samizdat as Extra-Gutenberg Phenomenon' *Poetics Today* 29, 4, (Winter 2008).

2.50) Long, D. Stephen and Richard J. Barry IV, 'Symphonic Theology and the Cacophonous World: Barth and Solovyev on Political Theology', *Correlating Sobornost: Conversations between Karl Barth and the Russian Orthodox Tradition,* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2016), 241-272,

2.51) Lossky, Vladimir, *Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church,* (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co, 1957).

2.52) Louth, Andrew, *Discerning the Mystery*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1990).

2.53) Louth, Andrew, *Modern Orthodox Thinkers: From the Philokalia to the Present Day,* (London: SPCK, 2015).

2.54) Lukasevicius, Arturas, *Aleksandr Men's Approach to the World's Religions: A Critical Evaluation in Light of the Declaration Dominus Iesus,* (Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller, 2007).

2.55) Lukasevicius, Arturas, ‘Evaluation of Alexander Men’s Views on Brahmanism in the Light of the Declaration Dominus Iesus’, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330963228_Evaluation_of_Alexander_Men's_Views_on_Brahmanism_in_the_Light_of_the_Declaration_Dominus_Iesus [Accessed 22/05/2019].

2.56) ‘Maximus the Greek’ in *New Encyclopaedia Britannica*, https://www.britannica.com/biography/Maximus-the-Greek [Accessed 16/07/2018].

2.57) ed. Meerson-Aksenov, Michael and Boris Shragin, *The Political, Social and Religious Thought of Russian “Samizdat” - An Anthology,* (Belmont MA: Nordland, 1977).

2.58) ‘Michael Psellus’ in *Encyclopaedia Britannica,* 2019, https://www.britannica.com/biography/Michael-Constantine-Psellus

2.59) Moss, Yonatan, ‘Saving Severus: How Severus of Antioch’s Writings Survived in Greek’, in *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 56 (2016) pp. 785-808, p. 807.

2.60) Mullaney, Daniel, ‘Creation and Evolution: The Problem of Evil in the Writings and Lectures of Alexander Men’, *Koinonia: The Journal of the Anglican & Eastern Churches Association,* No. 67, 32-51.

2.61) Mullaney, Daniel, ‘Review of Men, Alexander, *The Wellsprings of Religion. Vol. I of the History of Religion. In Search of the Way, the Truth, and the Life.* translated Alasdair MacNaughton. (New York: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2017).’ *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History, 70*(1), (2019), 214-216.

2.62) Negrov, Alexander I., *Biblical Interpretation in the Russian Orthodox Church: A Historical and Hermeneutical Perspective,* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008).

2.63) Negrov, Alexander, 'Fr. Sergius Bulgakov (1871-1944): A study in the Eastern Orthodox hermeneutical perspective', *HTS Teologiese Studies* 58(1) 2002, 250-263.

2.64) 'Nicholas Cabasilas' in *Encyclopaedia Britannica,* 2015, https://www.britannica.com/biography/Nicholas-Cabasilas.

2.65) Pelikan, Jaroslav: *Christianity and Culture: The Metamorphosis of Natural Theology in the Christian Encounter with Hellenism,* (New York: Vail-Ballou Press, 1993).

2.66) Pikus, Tadeusz, *Aksjologiczny wymiar religii w twórczości Aleksandra Mienia: studium analityczno-krytyczne,* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sióstr Loretanek, 1998).

2.67) Pikus, Tadeusz, 'Duchowe oblicze Europy i świata w dziełach Aleksandra Mienia', *Collectanea Theologica 72/3*, 2002, 113-133.

2.68) Pikus, Tadeusz, 'Twórczość pisarska o. aleksandra mienia, kapłana rosyjskiej Cerkwi', *Studia Theologica Varsaviensia* 31/2, 253-266.

2.69) Plekon, Michael, 'Alexander Men: A Modern Martyr, Free in the Faith, Open to the World', *Living Icons: Persons of the Faith in the Eastern Church,* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002).

2.70) Plekon, Michael, 'Review Essay: Missionary and Martyr in Moscow: A Review of Recent Works By and About Fr. Alexander Men', *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review,* Vol. 41, Nos. 2-3, 1996.

2.71) *Pseudo-Dionysius: the complete works,* trans. Colm Luibhéid, (New York: Paulist, 1987).

2.72) Schleiermacher, Friedrich, *On Religion: Speeches to its Cultured Despisers,* 1st ed, trans. Richard Crouter, 2nd ed, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

2.73) Schleiermacher, Friedrich, *The Christian Faith.* (Berkeley CA: Apocryphile Press, 2011).

2.74) Schmemann, Alexander, 'Role of Honour', *St Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly 2* (1954), 6.

2.75) Schmemann, Alexander, 'Russian Theology: 1920-1972, An Introductory Survey,' *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly 16* (1972).

2.76) Schweitzer, Albert, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus,* second ed., translated W. Montgomery, (New York: Dover, 2005).

2.77) Sergeev, Mikhail, 'Liberal Orthodoxy: From Vladimir Solov′ev to Fr. Alexander Men', *Occasional Papers on Religion in Eastern Europe,* Vol. 23, 4. Article 2. 2003.

2.78) van Seters, John, *Abraham in History and Tradition* (London: YUP, 1975).

2.79) 'Sister Joanna Reitlinger', https://saintannesnorthampton.weebly.com/reitlinger.html [Accessed 21/04/2019].

2.80) Soviet Writers' Congress 1934: The Debate on Socialist Realism and Modernism, https://www.marxists.org/subject/art/lit_crit/sovietwritercongress/index.htm [Accessed 22/05/2019].

2.80) Speaking for Jesus: An Interview with Robert Powell, https://www.history.co.uk/shows/robert-powell-the-real-jesus-of-nazareth/articles/speaking-for-jesus-an-interview-with-robert [Accessed 21.04.2019].

2.81) Teilhard de Chardin, Pierre, *Hymn of the Universe,* (London: Fontana, 1970).

2.82) Teilhard de Chardin, Pierre, *Phenomenon of Man,* (New York: Harper Perennial, 2008).

2.83) *The Greek New Testament*. Ed. by Aland, Black, Martini, Metzger, Wikgren, (Munster: 1975).

2.84) St. Theodore the Studite, *Patrologia Graeca 99*, 340, Eng. trans. from Ilarion Alfeev: Theology of the Icon in the Orthodox Church. Lecture at St. Vladimir's Seminary, 5 February 2011. https://mospat.ru/en/2011/02/06/news35783/#_ftn6 [Accessed 19.04.2019].

2.85) Thiselton, Anthony C., *Hermeneutics*, *An Introduction*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009).

2.86) Thompson, Thomas, *The Historicity of the Patriarchal Narratives: The Quest for the Historical Abraham,* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1974)

2.87) Trubetskoi, Evgenii, *Icons: Theology in Color,* translated Vakar, Gertrude, (New York: SVS Press, 1973).

2.88) Vallière, Paul, *Modern Russian Theology: Orthodox Theology in a New Key,* (New York: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2000).

2.89) Waintrub, Alexander, 'Speaking icons', *Word & Image 18:3,*(2002), 99-104.

2.90) Wehrle, Janet M., *'The Life of Aleksandr Men': Hagiography in the Making – The Aleksandr*

Men' Memoirs as Hagiography', The Greek Orthodox Theological Review Vol. 44, Nos. 1-4, 1999 and *Religion in Eastern Europe* 19, no. 3 (1999): pp. 18-42.

2.91) Williams, Rowan, *Sergii Bulgakov: Towards a Russian Political Theology,* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999).

2.92) Zachhuber, Johannes, *Human Nature in Gregory of Nyssa: Philosophical Background and Theological Significance,* (Leiden: Brill, 1999).

2.93) Zenkovsky, Vasilii Vasil′evich, *A History of Russian Philosophy, Volume Two,* trans. George Kline, (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1953).

2.94) Zizioulas, John, *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church,* (Crestwood NY: SVS Press, 1997).

2.95) Аверинцев С. Миссионер для племени интеллигентов. - Литературная газета. 4 сент. 1991г.: http://yakov.works/library/13_m/myen/de_aver1991.html [Accessed 22/05/2019].

2.96) Аверинцев С. С. О языке Церкви. Https://azbyka.ru/otechnik/Sergej_Averincev/o-jazyke-tserkvi/ [Accessed 02/02/2018].

2.97) Аверинцев С. С. Почему Евангелия – не биографии? Https://azbyka.ru/otechnik/Sergej_Averincev/pochemu-evangelija-ne-biografii [Accessed 02/02/18].

2.98) Аверинцев, С. С. Собранные сочинения. Том 2 София-Логос словарь. Киев: Дух и литера, 2006.

2.99) Аверинцев С.С. Стилистические проблемы библейского перевода - Собранные сочинения. Том 2 София-Логос словарь. 831-840. https://pravoslavnaya-obshina.ru/1996/no35/article/sergei-averincev-stilisticheskie-problemy-bibleiskog/ [Accessed 23/05/2019].

2.100) Адамянц Р. А. Значение библиологического словаря о. А. Меня https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jg62prG-D44 [Accessed 21/05/2018].

2.101) Адамянц Р. А. Отец Александр Мень и его отношение к библейской критике. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CpKv4BTP4DM [Accessed 18/05/2018].

2.102) Александр Мень. Собрание сочинений в 15 томах. https://psmb.ru/a/aleksandr-Men-sobranie-sochineniy-v-15-tomah.html [Accessed 30/05/18].

2.102) Аман Ив. Отец Александр Мень. Христов свидетель в наше время. М.: Рудомино, 1995.

2.103) Андреев Г., Юдин А. Жизнь с Богом: Брюссель–Москва. М.: Культурно-просветительский центр «Духовная библиотека», 2013.

2.104) Андреева А. От составителя – Отец Александр Мень отвечает на вопросы слушателей. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1999.

2.105) Антиминсов С. Протоиерей Александр Мень как комментатор священного писания. - Протоиерей Александр Мень как комментатор священного писания. Санкт-Петербург: Общество памяти игумении Таисии, 2006, с. 3-52.

2.106) Антология: Ранние отцы Церкви. Брюссель: Жизнь с Богом, 1988. (see 1.1.10)

2.107) Антоний (Мельников). Открытое письмо священнику Александру Меню. - Протоиерей Александр Мень как комментатор священного писания. Санкт-Петербург: Общество памяти игумении Таисии, 2006, с. 3-52.

2.108) Афанасьев Н. Служение мирян в Церкви. М.: Издание Свято-Филаретовской московской высшей православно-христианской школы, 1995. https://azbyka.ru/otechnik/Nikolaj_Afanasev/ [Accessed 08/07/18].

2.109) Афанасьев Н. Трапеза Господня. М.: <Quo Vadis>, 2011. https://azbyka.ru/otechnik/Nikolaj_Afanasev/ [Accessed 08/07/18].

2.110) Афанасьев Н. Церковь Духа Святого. Рига: Балто-славянское общество культурного развития и сотрудничества, 1994. https://azbyka.ru/otechnik/Nikolaj_Afanasev/ [Accessed 08/07/18].

2.111) Беглов А. Пастырская деятельность отца Александра Меня: опыт систематизации - Альфа и Омега 2-3 (64-65). М.: 2012, с. 348-363.

2.112) Бергсон. А. Творческая эволюция, М.: 1914.

2.113) Бердяев Н.А. Новое религиозное сознание и общественность СПб: М.В. Пирожков, 1907.

2.114) Бердяев Н.А. Философия свободного духа, ч. 1, Париж: YMCA, 1927.

2.115) Бердяев Н. А. Философия свободы. Часть II, Глава V.1. http://www.vehi.net/berdyaev/filos_svob/05.html [Accessed 17/12/2018].

2.116) Библия. Книги Священного Писания. Ветхого и Нового Завета в Синодальном переводе с комментариями и приложениями. М.: Российское Библейское общество, 2017. (see 1.1.9)

2.117) Библия. Книги Священного Писания. Ветхого и Нового Завета. Канонические. Современный русский перевод. М.: Российское Библейское общество, 2017.

2.118) Булгаков С.прот. Агнец Божий. Париж: YMCA-PRESS, 1933.

2.119) Булгаков С.прот. Апокалипсис Иоанна: Опыт догматического истолкования. Париж: YMCA-Press, 1948.

2.120) Булгаков С.Н. Апокалиптика и соцализм. - Два Града. Исследования о природе общественных идеалов. М.: Издательство Олега Абышко, 2008.

2.121) Булгаков С. Н. Два града: Исследования о природе общественных идеалов. М.: Издательство Олега Абышко, 2008.

2.122) Булгаков С.прот. Купина неопалимая: Опыт догматического истолкования некоторых черт в православном почитании Богоматери. Париж: YMCA-Press, 1927.

2.123) Булгаков С. прот. Невеста Агнца. Париж: YMCA-Press, 1945.

2.124) Булгаков, С.прот. Православие: Очерки учения Православной Церкви. Спб.: Издательство Олега Абышко, 2011

2.125) Булгаков С.Н. Тихие думы. Этика, культура, софиология. СПб.: Издательство Олега Абышко, 2008.

2.126) Булгаков С. Н. Трагедия философии. http://litresp.ru/kniga/ru/%D0%91/bulgakov-sergej-nikolaevich/tragediya-filosofii [Accessed 23/09/18].

2.127) Булгаков С. Н. Труды о Троичности. М.: ОГИ, 2001.

2.128) Булгаков С.Н. Философия кн. С.Н. Трубецкого и духовная борьба современности (рецензия). “Вопросы Философии и Психологии”, 1909. Вып.1, январь: http://ivashek.com/ru/texts/philosophy-texts/802-filosofiya-kn-s-n-trubetskogo-i-dukhovnaya-borba-sovremennosti-retsenziya [Accessed 04/10/2018].

2.129) Булгаков С.Н. Философия хозяйства. М.: ТЕРРА-Книжный клуб, 2008.

2.130) Бультман Р. Избранное: Вера и понимание. М.: Российская политическая энциклопедия, 2004.

2.131) Буфеев К. Об эволюционистском богословии Тейяра де Шардена и протоиерея Александра Меня, 27/12/2016. http://dsnmp.ru/svyashhennik-konstantin-bufeev-ob-evolyutsionistskom-bogoslovii-teyyara-de-shardena-i-protoiereya-aleksandra-menya/ [Accessed 22/05/2019].

2.132) Буфеев К. О возрождении манихейской ереси в эволюционистском богословии протоиерея Александра Меня. https://www.blagogon.ru/biblio/757/print [Accessed 20/05/2019].

2.133) Буфеев К. Отец Александр Мень: сказочник или сочинитель апокпифов? http://www.blagogon.ru/articles/243/ [Accessed 19/09/2018].

2.134) Бухарев А. М. Исследования Апокалипсис. Сергиевъ Посадъ: Богословского Вестника,

1916.

2.135) Бычков С. С. Хроника нераскрытого убийства. М.: Русское рекламное издательство, 1996. http://imwerden.de/pdf/bychkov_khronika_neraskrytogo_ubijstva_1996_text.pdf [Accessed 22/04/2018]. (see 1.1.16, 1.2.31, 1.2.59, 1.3.2, 1.3.32, 1.3.35, 1.3.36, 1.7.16)

2.136) Ваганова Н.А. Софиология протоиерея Сергия Булгакова. М.: Издательство ПСТГУ, 2011.

2.137) Василенко Л. И. (ред.) В защиту имени отца Александра Меня (сборник статей). М.: 1993. http://litresp.ru/chitat/ru/%D0%92/vasilenko-leonid-ivanovich/v-zaschitu-imeni-otca-aleksandra-menya-sbornik-statej [Accessed 22/01/2018].

2.138) Василенко Л. И. Мень о католичество: комментарии. М.: Теология №5, 1993, 113-128.

2.139) Вернадский В.И. Биосфера и ноосфера. Айрис-пресс, 2012.

2.140) Вернадский В.И. Черты мировоззрения князя С.Н. Трубецкого. http://ldn-knigi.lib.ru/R/Vern_Trub.htm [Accessed 17/12/2018].

2.141) Вертман Ю. Записи и примечания. М.: 1992.

2.142) Вершилло Р. В Российском Библейском обществе — полная смена декораций https://antimodern.wordpress.com/2010/09/23/rbo/ [Accessed 24/05/2018].

2.143) Вершиддо Р. о. Булгаков, Сергей Николаевич https://antimodern.wordpress.com/2009/02/05/о-булгаков-сергей-николаевич [Accessed 20/06/2018].

2.144) Вершилло Р. о. Флоренский, Павел Александрович. https://antimodern.wordpress.com/2012/09/20/florensky-3/ [Accessed 20/06/2018].

2.145) Вершилло, Р. о. Мень, Александр Вольфович. https://antimodern.ru/men-alexandr/ [Accessed 19/09/2018].

2.146) Винковецкая Д. «...Ваш о. Александр». СПб.: Фонд русской поэзии, 1999. (see 1.7.11)

2.147) Владимир Путин: слово протоиерея Александра Меня помогало людям находить духовную опору, https://www.newsru.com/religy/10sep2015/putin_menj.html [Accessed 22/05/19].

2.148) Гарнак, Адолф фон. История догматов – Общая история европейской культуры. СПб., 1911. Т.6.

2.149) Гарнак, Адолф фон. Сущность христианства, М., 1907.

2.150) Гайденко П. П. Апокалиптика, хилиазм и эллинская философия. Https://iphras.ru/site/sci_spir/gaidenko_texts_ahef.html#_ftn2 [Accessed 22/01/2018].

2.151) Гайденко П. П. <Конкретный идеализм> С. Н. Трубецкого. Трубецкой С. Н. Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994, с. 3-42.

2.152) Гамазкова Т. Отец Александр Мень и Мария Вениаминовна Юдина: http://www.doroga-vmeste.ru/2007/2007_3_o_a_men_mv_judina.shtml [Accessed 23/05/2019].

2.153) Гелеван В. Жизненный путь и научное наследие профессора Духовной Академии М. А.

Старокадомского (доктор. дисс.). Московская духовная академия. 03/06/2005.

2.154) Горский А. Максим грек Святогорец (1859). переизд. СПб: Аксион эстин, 2007 (https://azbyka.ru/otechnik/Aleksandr_Gorskij/maksim-grek-svjatogorets/ [Accessed 20/09/18]).

2.155) Григоренко М. V Меневские чтения. “Протоиерей Александр Мень и его время” - “Альфа и Омега”, 2010, № 58. https://www.pravmir.ru/v-menevskie-chteniya-protoierey-aleksandr-men-i-ego-vremya/ [Accessed 22/05/2019].

2.156) Двадцать лет без отца Александра Меня. И с ним. Ред. Гениева Е.Ю., Рашковский Е.Б. М.: Центр книги Рудомино, 2010,

2.157) Добыкин Д.Г., Тарнакин Н.А. Актуальные вопросы в трудах православных библеистов в СССР. Период с 1953 по 1964гг. - Христианское чтение 6, 2017, 108-122.

2.158) Добыкин Д.Г., Тарнакин Н.А. Текстология и библейская история в трудах православных библеистов в СССР. Период с 1953 по 1964гг. - Христианское чтение 5, 2017, 61-74.

2.159) Домбровская С. Пастырь. Рига: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2004.

2.160) Евсеев И.Е. Соборь и Библия. Http://www.biblia.ru/reading/articles/show/?12&start=0 [Accessed 22/05/18].

2.161) Еремин. А. А. Отец Александр Мень. Пастырь на рубеже веков. М.: «Carte Blanche», 2001. (see 1.8.9)

2.162) Ермишин О. Т. Княз С.Н. Трубецкой. Жизнь и философия: биография. М.: СИНАКСИС,

2011 Заявление Правления Российского Библейского Общества в связи с созданием Института Библии. 18 Февраля 2011. http://www.sclj.ru/news/detail.php?SECTION_ID=240&ELEMENT_ID=3234&print=Y. [Accessed 23/05/18].

2.163) Ерофеева К. Л. Специфика современного религиозного сознания в свете наследия В. С. Соловьева и о. А. Меня – Соловьевские исследования. Вып. 3(27). 2010. 45-51.

2.164) Забельшанский Г. Александр Юликов. Экспозиция работ, http://www.ncca.ru/events.text?id=12 [Accessed 20.04.2019].

2.165) Зайцева Ю. В Москве создается Институт Библии Http://www.blagovest-info.ru/index.php?ss=2&s=3&id=39369 [Accessed 31/03/18].

2.166) Зайцева Ю. «Отец Александр Мень – еще и художник» http://www.blagovest-info.ru/index.php?ss=2&s=4&id=60150 [Accessed 21/04/2019].

2.167) Зайцева Ю. Отец Александр Мень: Христоцентричность во всем. Http://www.blagovest-info.ru/index.php?ss=2&s=3&id=55991 [Accessed 30/04/2018].

2.168) Занемонец А. Проблема наследия отца Александра Меня в современном русском Православии (2010) (http://www.bogoslov.ru/text/1083016.html [Accessed 26/07/1983]).

2.169) Зелинский В. “206 Avenue De La Couronne” – Христианос, 1998 (VII).

2.170) Зорин А. Ангел-чернорабочий. М.: Прогресс-культура, 1993.

2.171) Иоаннуарий (Ивлиев). Мудрость равновесия (Новозаветные переводы С.С. Аверинцева) http://spbda.ru/publications/arhimandrit-iannuariy-ivliev-mudrost-ravnovesiya-novozavetnye-

perevody-s-s-averinceva/ [Accessed 26/05/2018].

2.172) Иларион (Алфеев). Письма апостола Павла: http://biblia.ru/reading/articles/show/?6&start=0 [Accessed 24/05/2018].

2.173) Иларион (Алфеев). Язык Учителя и жаргон кабака: http://biblia.ru/reading/articleas/show/?8&start=0 [Accessed 26/05/2018].

2.174) Иларион (Троицкий). Священное Писание и Церковь. М.: 1914.

2.175) Илюшенко В. И. Отец Александр Мень: Жизнь, смерть, бессмертие. М.: Эксмо книгоноша, 2013. (see 1.3.28, 1.6.2, 1.7.5, 1.7.9, 1.7.12, 1.8.1)

2.176) св. Иоанн Златоуст. Беседы на книгу Бытия (https://azbyka.ru/otechnik/Ioann_Zlatoust/tolk_01/3 [Accessed 18/06/2018]).

2.177) Иустин (Попович) Челийский. Православная Церковь и экуменизм: https://azbyka.ru/otechnik/Iustin_Popovich/pravoslavnaja-tserkov-i-ehkumenizm/ [Accessed 22/05/2019].

2.178) Канонические Евангелия. М.: Восточная литература, 1992.

2.179) Карелин, Феликс. О домостроительных пределах богоизбранности еврейского народа. - Протоиерей Александр Мень как комментатор священного писания. Санкт-Петербург: Общество памяти игумении Таисии, 2006, с. 53-67.

2.180) Карташев А. В. Ветхозаветная библейская критика. Париж: YMCA-PRESS, 1947, (http://www.golubinski.ru/ecclesia/kartashev/kritika.htm [Accessed 25/05/2017]).

2.181) Карташев А. В. Православие в его отношениях к историческому процессу. - Православный мысль, 1948, № 6, (http://www.golubinski.ru/ecclesia/kartashev/pravoslavie.htm [Accessed 25/07/2018]).

2.182) Книга протоиерея Александра Меня «Сын Человеческий». Сергиев Посад: Дубрава, 2015, 17-21: https://radubrava.ru/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/son-of-man.pdf [Accessed 20/04/2018].

2.183) Кода, Пьеро. Сергей Булгаков. М.: Издательство ББИ, 2015.

2.184) Колупаев В.Е. Брюссельское издательство <Жизнь с Богом>: Книжный мир Русского Зарубежья XX века Радиомиссия для советских слушателей. Saarbrücken: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing, 2012.

2.185) Кротов Я. Теология и топор. 10 Сентябрь 2016. http://www.svoboda.org/a/27977521.html [Accessed 19/09/2018].

2.186) Кузнецова В.Н. Апостолы свободы. М.: Общедоступный православный университет, 2012.

2.187) Кузнецова В.Н. Мы работали с отцом Александром Менем в электричках: http://www.pravmir.ru/valentina-kuznetsova-myi-rabotali-s-aleksandrom-menem-v-elektrichkah/ [Accessed 26/05/2018].

2.188) Кузнецова В.Н. Смешное в библии: http://polit.ru/articles/2015/08/09/kuznetsova/ [Accessed 26/05/2018].

2.189) Кузнецова В.Н., Мень П.В. Предисловие. - Мень А.прот. Как читать библию. Часть первая.

2.190) Кураев А. Александр Мень: Потерявшийся миссионер: http://ruskline.ru/analitika/2010/09/10/aleksandr_men_poteryavshijsya_missioner/ [Accessed 22/05/2019].

2.191) Левинская И. Размышляя над рецензией иеромонаха Илариона Алфеева на Письма Апостола Павла. Пер. и прим. В.Н. Кузнецовой. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1998: http://biblia.ru/reading/articles/show/?7&start=0 [Accessed 25/05/2018].

2.192) Левитин-Краснов А. Э. Письмо папе Павлу VI О положении Русской Православной Церкви. Париж-Нью-Йорк: Вестник РСХД №95-95 I-II 1970.

2.193) Леденев В. Александр Юликов: «Я понимал, что буду заниматься чем-то непризнанным, неоплачиваемым и преследуемым» https://www.colta.ru/articles/art/14530-aleksandr-yulikov-ya-ponimal-chto-budu-zanimatsya-chem-to-nepriznannym-neoplachivaemym-i-presleduemym [Accessed 20.04.2019].

2.194) Лезов С.В. Национальная идея и христианство – Попытки понимания: избранные работы. СПб.: Университетская книга, 1998.

2.195) Лезов С.В. Новый завет и юдофобия – Попытки понимания: избранные работы. СПб.: Университетская книга, 1998.

2.196) Лезов С.В. О непроисхождении христианства из юдаизма – Попытки понимания: избранные работы. СПб.: Университетская книга, 1998.

2.197) Лезов С. В. Очерки современного православного либерализма - Попытки понимания: избранные работы. СПб: Университетская книга, 1998.

2.198) Лезов С.В. Христианин в христианстве – Попытки понимания: избранные работы. СПб.: Университетская книга, 1998,

2.199) Лёзов С. и Огнёв А. Лингвист Сергей Лёзов: «Если всё было фигней — мы стали ближе к истине» - Троицкого варианта — Наука. 29.03.2017. № 225. 8–9: http://trv-science.ru/2017/03/29/lyozov/ [Accessed 26/05/18].

2.200) Лосский Н. О. История русской философии. М.: Советский писатель, 1990.

2.201) Масленикова З. А. К истории книги о. Александра Меня «Сын человеческий». - «Aequinox». Сборник памяти о. А. Меня. (ред. Вишневецкий И. Г., Рабинович Е. Г.) М.: “Carte Blanche”. 1991, 179-181.

2.202) Масленикова З. А. Жизнь отца Александра Меня. М.: Русслит, 1995. (http://krotov.info/library/13_m/as/lennikova_1b.htm [Accessed 07/07/2018]). (see 1.1.15, 1.1.16, 1.2.36, 1.7.2, 1.8.3)

2.203) Мень М.А. “Чтобы умереть было не стыдно” - Новые заветы: самые известные люди России о своих мечтах, страхах и успехах. М.: “Русский пионер”, 2016.

2.204) Мень П. В. Александр Юликов оформляет книги Александра Меня 30.03.2017 Открытие Выставки Вкчер at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gNtRWqT9kUA [Accessed 20.04.2019].

2.205) Насонова М. Голоса апостолов – НГ-религии 12(35) 23/06/1999.

2.206) Негров А.И. Вопросы библейской герменевтики в творчестве П.А. Флоренского – ред. Порус В.Н. Философско-богословское наследие П.А. Флоренского и современность: На пути к синтетическому единству европейской культуры. М.: Библейско-богословский институт св. апостола Андрея, 2006. 25-39.

2.207) Новая книга об отце Александре Мене, нужная и своевременная. https://pretre-philippe.livejournal.com/496578.html, [Accessed 22/05/2019].

2.208) Образование в 1990 г. Библейского общества Советского Союза (БОСС) и его преобразование в РБО в 1991 году http://www.biblia.ru/rbo/history/page_18.htm [Accessed 22/05/2018].

2.209) Пархоменко К. О комментариях, напечатанные в Брюссельской Библии https://azbyka.ru/forum/threads/o-biblii-s-kommentarijami.837/ [Accessed 18.04.2018].

2.210) Петухов А., свящ. К статье прот. А. Меня «К истории русской православной библеистики». М.: Духовные учебные заведения и духовное просвещение в России, 2006. с. 19-20. (http://lavravcheremushkah.ru/images/articles/public/01-1.pdf, [Accessed 07/07/2018]).

2.211) Предеин Д., прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как выдающийся православный катехизатор и миссионер второй половины XX века. Одесса: “Астропринт”, 2015.

2.212) Протоиерей Александр Мень как комментатор священного писания. Санкт-Петербург: Общество памяти игумении Таисии, 2006.

2.213) Рашковский Е.Б. Владимир Соловьёв и протоиерей Александр Мень в динамике истории российской – Соловьевские исследования. Выпуск № 2(30)/2011, 32-44.

2.214) Рижский М. И. Русская библия. История переводов Библии в Росии. СПб: Авалон Азбука-классика, 2007.

2.215) Российское Библейское Общество. Цели и задачи. http://www.biblia.ru/about/aims/ [Accessed 22/05/18].

2.216) Селезнев М.Г. Исследуйте Писания. О переломном моменте в истории русской библеистики. Журнал Московской Патриархии № 2, 2014: http://www.pravmir.ru/issledujte-pisaniya-o-perelomnom-momente-v-istorii-russkoj-bibleistiki/ [Accessed 29/05/2018].

2.217) Селезнев М.Г. О пользе библейской критики для христианского богословия: http://www.pravmir.ru/o-polze-biblejskoj-kritiki-dlya-xristianskogo-bogosloviya/ [Accessed 29/05/2018].

2.218) Селезнев М. “Христианская библеистика: история и апологетика” (14/02/2015). https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1j92DpuUKTc [Accessed 29/05/2018].

2.219) Солдатов А. Духовные внуки. Огонек. 30.12.2007 (https://www.kommersant.ru/doc/2300073 [Accessed 18/06/2018]).

2.220) Соловьев В. С. Исторія и будущность теократіи, Собрание сочинений. 2-е изд. Том четверый. Спб.: Книгоиздательское Товарищество “Просвѣщеніе”, 1912.

2.221) Соловьев В. С. Когда жили еврейские пророки? Собрание сочинений. Том седмой. Брюссель: Foyer Oriental Chrétien, 1970.

2.222) Соловьев В. С. Предуведомление (изд. 1924). Собрание сочинений. Том одинадцатий.

Брюссель: Foyer Oriental Chrétien, 1970, с. 68-83.

2.223) Соловьев В.С. Три разговора – Собрание сочинений. Том десятый.

2.224) Соловьев В. С. Чтения о Богочеловечестве, Собрание сочинений. 2-е изд. Том третий. Спб.: Книгоиздательское Товарищество “Просвѣщеніе”, 1912.

2.225) Сысоев, Д. О протоиерее Александре Мене (http://www.blagogon.ru/biblio/725/ [Accessed 07/07/2018]).

2.226) Тавров. А. М. Сын человеческий: Об отце Александре Мене. М.: Эксмо, 2014.

2.227) Тареев М. М. Искушение Господа нашего Иисуса Христа. М.: Печатня А. И. Снегировой, 1900. (https://predanie.ru/tareev-mihail-mihaylovich/book/210560-iskusheniya-gospoda-nashego-iisusa-hrista/ [Accessed 26/07/2018]).

2.228) Тареев М. М. Основы христианства. Том II. Евангелие. Сергиевъ Посадъ: Типографія Св.-Тр. Сергіевой Лавры, 1908.

2.229) Тейяр де Шарден, Пьер. Феномен человека. М.: АСТ, 2002.

2.230) Трубецкая О.кн.. Княз С.Н. Трубецкой (Воспоминание сестры). Нью-Йорк: Издательство имени Чехова, 1953.

2.231) Трубецкой Е.Н. Смысл жизни / Сост. А.П. Полякова, П.П. Апрышко. М.: Республика, 1994. 223-291.

2.232) Трубецкой С.кн. Метафизика въ Древней Греціи. М.: Тип. Э. Лисснера и Ю. Романа,

1890, Трубецкой С.Н. Собрание сочинений Кн. Сергея Николаевича Трубецкого. Том III. М.: Тип. Г. Лисснера и Д. Собко, 1910.

2.233) Трубецкой С.кн. “Мнимое язычество или ложное христианство?”, Трубецкой С.Н. Собрание сочинений Кн. Сергея Николаевича Трубецкого. Том II. М.: Тип. Г. Лисснера и Д. Собко, 1910, 166-189.

2.234) Трубецкой С.Н. О природе человеческого сознания - Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 483-593.

2.235) Трубецкой С.Н. О святой Софии, Премудрости Божией – Вопросы философии. 1995, № 9. 120-168.

2.236) Трубецкой С.Н. Основания идеализма. - Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994, 594-717.

2.237) Трубецкой С. Н. Учение о логосе в его истории - Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994, с. 43-482.

2.238) Трубецкой С.кн. Этика и догматика. - Собрание сочинений Кн. Сергея Николаевича Трубецкого. Том II. М.: Тип. Г. Лисснера и Д. Собко, 1910, 139-168

2.239) Тураев Б. А. История древнего востока. Том II. Ленинград: Социально экон. изд., 1935.

2.240) Флоренский П.А. Из богословского наследия – Богословские Труды. Сб.17. М.: 137.

2.241) Флоренский П.А. Столп и утверждение истины (I). М.: Правда, 1990.

2.242) Флоренский П.А. Столп и утверждение истины (II). М.: Правда, 1990.

2.243) Флоренский П.А. У водоразделов мысли. М.: Правда, 1990.

2.244) Флорениский П.А. Храмовое действо как синтез искусств – Сочинения в четырех томах. Том 2. М.: Мысль, 1996. 378-382.

2.245) Харко А. Перспективы исследования богословского наследия о. Александра Меня (1935-1990): разработки прот. А. Меня в области русской библеистики: http://www.alexandermen.ru/readings/2015/sem_harko.html) [Accessed 15/02/18].

2.246) Чистяков. Г. Фрагмент из книги 'Путь, что ведет нас к Богу'. М.: 2010. http://biblia.ru/reading/articles/show/?11&start=0 [Accessed 23/05/2018].

2.247) Шихляров Л. прот. Церковь и культура: пространство для диалога (размышления на основе опыта прот. Александра Меня) – Меневские чтения 2015. http://www.alexandrmen.ru/readings/2015/sem_shihliarov.html [Accessed 11/02/2018].

2.248) Шмеман А. Д. Памяти отца Николая Афанасьева. Вестник РСХД, 1955. - №82. - с. 65-68.

2.249) Юликов А. Александр ЮЛИКОВ о работе на книгами Александра МЕНЯ Евгении ЗАВАДСКОЙ и в издательстве Искусст at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AmNjerlpt8k&list=PLWiyxSup4vrSJpVBs8cGg6UUr3XJgRKxi&index=3 [Accessed 20.04.2019].

2.250) Юнгеров П. Общее историко-критическое введение в священные Ветхозаветные книги. Казань: Типо-литогр. Имп. Ун-та, 1902.

Aleksandr Men as an Interpreter of the Bible

Creating Divine-human Culture with the Biblical Theologies of Sergei Nikolaevich Trubetskoi and the 'Russian School'

Annex 1: Russian-language materials

Annex 2: The Letters of Sergei Trubetskoi to Adolf von Harnack (1891-1894)

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Theology at the University of Oxford. By Daniel Mullaney, Wycliffe Hall, Trinity 2019.

Contents

Annex 1: Russian-language Materials 3

Introduction 3

Chapter 1 3

Chapter 2 11

Chapter 3 22

Chapter 4 48

Conclusion 54

Annex 2 The Letters of Sergei Trubetskoi to Adolf von Harnack (1891-1894) 55

Letter 1 (Beginning of stay in Kreuznach, July 1891) 55

Letter 2 (Kreuznach, 27th August 1891) 66

Letter 3 (Dec. 1891/Jan. 1892?) 79

Letter 4 (Dec. 1894?) 82

Annex 1: Russian-language Materials

This study relies to a significant extent on Russian-language materials. In order to include citations from Russian-language sources either in the main body of this study or in the footnotes, it has been necessary to translate these citations into English. The original Russian-language materials that have been translated have been deemed too substantial to include within the main body of the study, but the texts are given below in full under the note number to which they relate. References are included in round brackets after the text.

Introduction

n.44 Во Христе, подлинном Человеке, живет подлинный Бог. Так же как и в Писании: его автор – человек, поэт или прозаик, - все равно сохраняет свои особенности, хотя на него действует Дух Божий.

(Мень А.прот. Библия и литература М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, 184.)

n.46 ...лучше всего изложил основы библейского богословия....

(Мень А.прот. Русская религиозная философия: лекции. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008, 84.)

Chapter 1

n.79 Для многих людей этот возраст, ...оказывается моментом, когда они заново открывают то, о чем узнали от родных и учителей. Вещи, которые раньше принимались на веру как отвлеченная теория, через живой личный опыт становятся реальностью. Этот перелом охватывает огромный круг вопросов, и особенно важен он для веры. Станет ли она личным опытом, откроет ли человек ее заново для себя – вот что является главным. До тех пор пока это не произойдет, пока душа не встретит Бога на своем пути и не потянется к Нему, религия остается для нее системой взглядов, принимаемой в силу безотчетного доверия к авторитетам.

(Масленикова З.А. Жизнь отца Александра Меня. М.: Русслит, 1995. 97.)

n.84 Прот. Г. Флоровский, труд которого я прочел в конце студенческого периода, называл все это течение «декадентским». Он предлагал ориентироваться на митроп. Филарета (Дроздова), считал его чуть ли ни новым отцом Церкви. Но его аргументы в конце концов меня не убедили. Я прочел убийственную характеристику Филарета у историка С. Соловьева, а к тому же сам факт, что митрополит защищал в своем катехизисе крепостное право, телесные наказания и т. п., решил для меня спор.

(Масленикова З.А. Жизнь отца Александра Меня. М.: Русслит, 1995. 139.)

n.86 ...евангелический, профетический, нравственный дух....

(Масленикова З.А. Жизнь отца Александра Меня. М.: Русслит, 1995. 137.)

n.87 ...отец Александр заимствовал опыт общинной жизни и совместного изучения Писания у баптистов.

(Еремин. А.А. Отец Александр Мень. Пастырь на рубеже веков. М.: «Carte Blanche», 2001. 230-231.)

n.89 У других протестантов (либеральных) я нашел сочетание веры и библейской критики, в котором так нуждался (к слову сказать, за последнее время это сочетание упрочилось в католичестве и у наиболее просвещенных представителей православных).

(Масленикова З.А. Жизнь отца Александра Меня. М.: Русслит, 1995. 137.)

n.91 ...Я отчетливо услышал призыв перейти к делам, имеющим прямое отношение к проповеди веры, к уяснению людям смысла Библии и Евангелия. В те годы Св. Писание стало все чаще попадать в руки людей.... И я видел, насколько велики препятствия к пониманию Библии для рядового читателя, даже образованного, не говоря уж о прочих. В результате получился том (400 машинописных страниц) под названием: «О чем говорит и чему учит Библия». Книга вышла весьма несовершенная, но она стала черновым прототипом и планом для шеститомника «В поисках Пути» и в первую (по времени) очередь для «Сына Человеческого».

(Масленикова З.А. Жизнь отца Александра Меня. М.: Русслит, 1995, 139.)

n.100 Элементы монотеизма в дохристианской религии и философии.

(Вершилло Р. о. Мень, Александр Вольфович: https://antimodern.wordpress.com/2009/12/09/Men′-2/ [Accessed 08/02/2018].)

n.101 …в Академии Вы, кажется, единственный человек, которого действительно волнуют научные вопросы.

(Предеин Д.прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как выдающийся православный катехизатор и миссионер второй половины XX века. Одесса: “Астропринт”, 2015. 103-4.)

n.104 Группы создавались для изучения Священного Писания, молитвенного общения, совместного участия в литургии, взаимопомощи и помощи другим (больным, старым, одиноким), которые в ней нуждаются. Мы встречались раз в неделю, на квартире того или иного члена группы. По условиям того времени мы соблюдали конспирацию, не говорили по телефону об обсуждаемой теме, а лишь уточняли время встречи, расходились по одному – по двое, с некоторым интервалом.

(Илюшенко В.И. Отец Александр Мень. Жизнь, смерть, бессмертие. М.: Эксмо книгоноша, 2013. 369.)

n.114 ...настоящим библейским, христианским видением мира....

(Еремин. А.А. Отец Александр Мень. Пастырь на рубеже веков. М.: «Carte Blanche», 2001. 26.)

n.115 …открывает нам универсалистский пафос христианства.

(Еремин. А.А. Отец Александр Мень. Пастырь на рубеже веков. М.: «Carte Blanche», 2001. 20.)

n.117 По человеческому разумению, казалось бы, только сейчас и настало время, когда талант

отца Александра как проповедника Слова Божия и воссоздателя подлинно общинной приходской жизни и мог раскрыться во всей своей полноте.

(Двадцать лет без отца Александра Меня. И с ним. Ред. Гениева Е.Ю., Рашковский Е.Б. М.: Центр книги Рудомино, 2010. 213.)

n.126 ...выдающийся рус. ученый, филолог, экзегет, переводчик Библии....

(Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том второй К-П. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 374.)

n.130 Цитируя Новый Завет, автору пришлось отказаться от общеупотребительного синодального перевода. Достоинства его несомненны, но, сделанный более полутора веков назад, он устарел как в научном, так и в литературном отношении. Поэтому в книге использован (с некоторыми поправками) новый перевод, осуществленный в Париже под редакцией архиепископа Кассиана.

(Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2016, 12-13.)

n.131 Этот перевод, к сожалению, далек от совершенства, но его преимущество в том, что в нем учтены достижения современной текстуальной критики. При цитировании по этому переводу некоторых речей Спасителя текст расположен в соответствии с правилами священной библейской поэзии....

(Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2016. 408.)

n.132 При цитировании Священного Писания в основу был положен синодальный перевод, но для уяснения смысла некоторые места (особенно поэтические) были переведены автором заново по критическому изданию Ветхого Завета.

(Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие. Религиозный путь человечества до эпохи великих Учителей. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. 15.)

n.133 Автор не боялся слишком часто цитировать творения пророков. Однако в том виде, в каком они находятся в нашей синодальной Библии, они зачастую неясны и трудны для понимания. Приводя тексты в собственном посильном переводе по критическому изданию и в тесной связи с событиями жизни пророков, автор стремился облегчить читателю проникновение в смысл их писаний.

(Мень А.прот. Вестники Царства Божия. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2010. 26.)

n.140 ...всех желающих Священным Писанием на понятном для них языке и по доступной для них цене.

(Российское Библейское Общество. Цели и задачи. http://www.biblia.ru/about/aims/ [Accessed 22/05/18].)

n.141 Только на пути братского единения и уважения к многообразным формам церковной жизни можем мы надеяться вновь обрести силу, мир и благословение Божие.

(Чистяков. Г. Фрагмент из книги “Путь, что ведет нас к Богу”. М.: 2010: http://biblia.ru/reading/articles/show/?11&start=0 [Accessed 23/05/2018].)

n.143 Знакомство с этим переводом может повергнуть неподготовленного читателя в состояние глубокого шока.... по временам возникает ощущение, будто ты не священный текст читаешь, а присутствуешь при перебранке на кухне коммунальной квартиры.

….сознательная и последовательная десакрализация священного текста....

(Иларион (Алфеев). Письма апостола Павла: http://biblia.ru/reading/articles/show/?6&start=0 [Accessed 24/05/2018].)

n.145 ...попытка передать своеобразный стиль и манеру оригинала.

(Левинская И. Размышляя над рецензией иеромонаха Илариона Алфеева на Письма Апостола Павла. Пер. и прим. В.Н. Кузнецовой. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 1998: http://biblia.ru/reading/articles/show/?7&start=0 [Accessed 25/05/2018].)

n.146 …спорит не с В. Кузнецовой, а с о. Александром, причем по одному из самых принципиальных для о. Александра вопросов.

(Чистяков. Г. Фрагмент из книги “Путь, что ведет нас к Богу”. М.: 2010: http://biblia.ru/reading/articles/show/?11&start=0 [Accessed 23/05/2018].)

n.148 Он вообще очень уважал знания. И прежде всего ему хотелось, чтобы люди читали и знали Писание, чтобы понимали его. Он нам так и говорил: «Ребята, давайте сделаем новый перевод. Ну, пусть не умрут они дураками».

(Кузнецова В.Н. Мы работали с отцом Александром Менем в электричках: http://www.pravmir.ru/valentina-kuznetsova-myi-rabotali-s-aleksandrom-menem-v-elektrichkah/ [Accessed 26/05/2018].)

n.149 Сегодня в мировой практике библейских переводов господствует плюрализм. Признавая, что любой перевод в той или иной степени является интерпретацией оригинала, переводчики используют самые различные приемы и языковые установки – от классических литературных традиций до повседневного сленга. Это позволяет читателям ощутить различные измерения и оттенки текста. В отечественных переводах Библии мы также находим несколько подходов. Так, в традиционном синодальном переводе сохраняется близость к церковнославянскому языку, что связано с чисто историческими причинами. С. С. Аверинцев развивает эту тенденцию уже вполне сознательно и принципиально, стремясь сохранить языковую дистанцию, отделяющую нас от древного текста. С этой целью он вживается в мир русской архаической и архаизирующей поэтики, исходя, в частности, из наследия Вяч. Иванова. Переводы И. М. Дьяконова и И. Ш. Шифмана находятся в том же русле, что и их переводы древневосточной литературы: архаизмы подчеркнуты меньше, сохраняются особенности <народного> языка. В предлагаемом переводе Евангелия от Марка В. Н. Кузнецова идет по другому пути. Она стремится добиться максимального приближения к живому современному русскому языку. Отсюда отказ от архаизмов как в лексике, так и в грамматике, от исторически обусловленных семитизмов, от семантически стертых слов или слов, изменивших сегодня свое значение. В некоторых случаях, если древние реалии не имеют решающего смыслового значения, они переданы нейтральной русской лексикой. Отрывки, в которых четко прослеживается поэтическая структура, переведены стихами. Были учтены достижения современной экзегетики и филологии (в частности, по вопросу о соотношениях койнэ и семитического субстрата Евангелия), а также наиболее авторитетные современные переводы.

Предлагаемый перевод сделан по научному изданию, в котором учтены все древнейшие манускрипты и указаны их текстуальные особенности[1].

(Мень А.прот. Евангелие от Марка: Предисловие к новому переводу В.Н. Кузнецовой – Народы Азии и Африки 1989, 6, 112-4: 114.)

n.160 Кто не жил в те годы, лишь с большим усилием может вообразить или хотя бы воссоздать умом атмосферу рубежа пятидесятых и шестидесятых. Ведь семидесятые, каковы бы они ни были, - совершенно иной сюжет: тут уже сложился самиздат, и хотя бы в сголицах каждый желающий уважать себя интеллигент если не шел в неофиты, так по крайности симпатизировал таковым и старался поддерживать разговоры на религиозно-философские темы.... за о. Александром останется несравненная заслура: с самого начала не поддаться гипнозу ломавшей и сильных «исторической необходимости». Без героической позы, не отказываясь быть осторожным, но запретив себе даже тень капитулянтства, ни на миг не покладая рук, он сделал невозможное возможным. Он проторил дорогу. Теперь по ней пойдут другие....

(Аверинцев С.С. Миссионер для племени интеллигентов. http://krotov.info/library/13_m/myen/de_aver1991.html [Accessed 08/02/2018].)

1 The Greek New Testament. Ed. by K. Aland, M. Black, M. Martini, B. M. Metzger, A. Wikgren. Munster, 1975.

n.161 ….вошедших в язык библейских формул.

(Аверинцев С.С. Стилистические проблемы библейского перевода - Собранные сочинения. Том 2. София-Логос словарь. 838-839.)

n.170 Игровой контр-мир.... иллюзорную «альтернативную реальность»....

(Лезов С.В. Очерки современного православного либерализма – Попытки понимания: избранные работы. СПб.: Университетская книга, 1998. 198.)

n.172 ...правду русскому народу про Евангелие.

(Лёзов С. и Огнёв А. Лингвист Сергей Лёзов: «Если всё было фигней — мы стали ближе к истине» - Троицкого варианта — Наука. 29.03.2017. № 225. 8–9: http://trv-science.ru/2017/03/29/lyozov/ [Accessed 26/05/18].)

n.176 ...иллюзию научного творчества, критического... подхода к традиции. Иллюзию православной библеистики....

(Лезов С.В. Очерки современного православного либерализма – Попытки понимания: избранные работы. СПб.: Университетская книга, 1998. 206.)

n.179 ...некий синтез между ветхозаветными обычаями и новозаветной верой.

(Мень А. Что такое юдеохристианство? - Континент 95, 1998: http://www.golubinski.ru/ecclesia/iudeo.htm [Accessed 28/05/2018].)

n.181 …судьбы мира связаны с обращением еврейства ко Христу.

(Лезов С.В. Очерки современного православного либерализма – Попытки понимания: избранные работы. СПб.: Университетская книга, 1998. 201.)

n.182 ...идеальным евреем-христианином русского мессианизма.

(Лезов С.В. Очерки современного православного либерализма – Попытки понимания: избранные работы. СПб.: Университетская книга, 1998. 202.)

n.183 ...в другое измерение.

(Лезов С.В. Очерки современного православного либерализма – Попытки понимания: избранные работы. СПб.: Университетская книга, 1998. 197.)

n.184 Кому дано писать, кто давно получил на это благословение — обязан делать это. Писание есть часть пастырской работы, ее продолжение. Слова зачастую улетучиваются, написанное — остается.

(Мень А.прот. Два письма Владимиру Волгину: http://www.krotov.info/library/13_m/myen/2_1984volg.html.)

n.197 Он базировался на доступных ему изданиях, то есть преимущественно на дореволюционной литературе....

(Кураев А. Александр Мень: Потерявшийся миссионер: http://ruskline.ru/analitika/2010/09/10/aleksandr_men_poteryavshijsya_missioner/ [Accessed 22/05/2019].)

n.198 ...использование ярких и выразительных художественных образов....

(Добыкин Д.Г., Тарнакин Н.А. Текстология и библейская история в трудах православных библеистов в СССР. Период с 1953 по 1964гг. - Христианское чтение 5, 2017, 61-74: 67.)

n.203 Тональность книги очень спокойная и рассудительная – в чём-то это даже нетипично для отца Александра. Если он и обращается к какому-то яркому событию современности (конфликт в Карабахе, юбилей 500-летия открытия Америки), то использует его лишь как повод для историософских обобщений.... Действительно, в этом сборнике почти нет экстравагантных заявлений, не искромётных эмоций, нет миссионерской активности. Зато здесь отец Александр выступает как вдумчивый историк, уравновешенный, серьёзный аналитик, который способен мыслить масштабно и видеть пути Провидения в самых различных хитросплетениях истории.

(Предеин Д.прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как выдающийся православный катехизатор и миссионер второй половины XX века. Одесса: “Астропринт”, 2015. 60-61.)

n.214 Работая над словарем, отец Александр по мере возможности привлекал к работе над ним переводчиков, редакторов, технических сотрудников, просил найти материалы для какой-либо статьи. Как правило, помощниками были прихожане Сретенского храма в Новой деревне, которым он был бесконечно благодарен. Но, несомненно, основная работа проделана им самим. Отец Александр собрал, переработал и осмыслил обширнейший материал....

(Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый А-Й. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 7.)

n.219 При этом о. А. Мень отмечал, что «весь корпус приложений к этой Толковой Библии составлен редакцией изд-ва “Жизнь с Богом” главным образом по Иерусалимской Библии, а также на основе материалов отдельных авторов, как православных, так и католических. Экуменический характер издания связан с направленностью изд-ва, к-рое стремится содействовать диалогу православных и католиков». Комментарий о. А. Меня о том, что помимо Иерусалимской Библии в основу всего корпуса приложений к брюссельскому изданию были положены материалы «отдельных авторов, как православных, так и католических», представляется особенно значимым по одной простой причине. Одним из этих православных авторов был о. А. Мень. Утверждения о том, что этот выдающийся православный пастырь, библеист и апологет причастен к изданию Брюссельской Библии, являются общераспространенными. Но вот о том, каков был его конкретный вклад в составление комментариев и приложений к этому изданию, мнения расходятся. Одни источники утверждают, что «комментарии, напечатанные в Брюссельской Библии, - это комментарии отца Александра Меня», другие ограничивают его вклад комментированием отдельных книг Ветхого Завета, например, Пятикнижием и Пророками, а также составлением справочного аппарата и толкованиями к Новому Завету.

(Андреев Г., Юдин А. Жизнь с Богом: Брюссель–Москва. М.: Культурно-просветительский центр «Духовная библиотека», 2013. 137.)

Chapter 2

n.231 Богословие Хаоса – путь к “универсальной религии” Антихриста. …книги о. Александра разрушающе действуют на самые основы Православия.

(Антиминсов С.прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как комментатор священного писания. - Протоиерей Александр Мень как комментатор священного писания. Санкт-Петербург: Общество памяти игумении Таисии, 2006, 3-52, 52.)

n.232 Из тысяч написанных мною страниц Вы выискиваете именно те места, которые

кажутся Вам «неправославными».

(Мень А.прот. Два письма Владимиру Волгину.
http://www.krotov.info/library/13_m/myen/2_1984volg.html.)

n.234 Если бы литературно-богословский труд был несовместим с пастырством, Отцы Церкви, к которым Вы все время апеллируете, ничего не писали бы. И подают пример всем имеющим призвание.

(Мень А.прот. Два письма Владимиру Волгину:
http://www.krotov.info/library/13_m/myen/2_1984volg.html.)

n.236 Снисходя к обычаю человеческому....

(https://azbyka.ru/otechnik/Ioann_Zlatoust/tolk_01/3 [Accessed 18/06/2018].)

n.238 В Православной Энциклопедии, выходившей с разрешения церковной цензуры, признается «присутствие разного рода *неточностей* - исторических, хронологических и топографических - равно и разногласий у священных писателей» (т. 2, с. 736). Этот факт свидетельствует, что по примеру Божию, им было дано быть подлинными соавторами Духа, сохранившими все особенности своей человеческой природы.

(Мень А.прот. Два письма Владимиру Волгину:
http://www.krotov.info/library/13_m/myen/2_1984volg.html.)

n.243 …концепции этой школы стали господствующими... *нет ни одного православного* (и католического) библеиста, который имел бы другие взгляды.

(Мень А.прот. Два письма Владимиру Волгину:
http://www.krotov.info/library/13_m/myen/2_1984volg.html.)

n.246 В Ветхом Завете многие описания чудес являются лишь поэтическими метафорами. Потому что Ветхий Завет... это сложная система жанров, и когда там говорится, что горы скачут и прочее, не надо понимать это буквально. Это язык поэзии, сказания, легенды.

(Мень А.прот. Почему нам трудно поверить в Вода? М: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2005 (переизд. 2008) 7-94, 42.)

n.249 Конечно, комментарии самого отца Александра не могут заменить свода святоотеческих толкований, но они вполне в состоянии послужить прекрасным для них дополнением.

(Предеин Д.прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как выдающийся православный катехизатор и миссионер второй половины XX века. Одесса: “Астропринт”, 2015. 273.)

n.257 требовали искать прежде всего прямого, «исторического» смысла тектса, предостерегали от натяжек и поисков «таинственного смысла там, где его нет», а также определяли приемы для разрешения кажущихся библейских противоречий.

(Мень А.прот. К истории русской православной библеистики. - Навстречу Христу. М: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. 325.)

n.264 Он явился последней суммарной попыткой утвердить позиции старой исагогики с привлечением солидного научного аппарата. В дальнейшем русская библейско-историческая школа отказалась от этих позиции и от смешения исагогических проблем со сферой догматической.

(Мень А.прот. К истории русской православной библеистики. - Навстречу Христу. М: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. 351.)

n.276 ...реализацию божественного идеала в земной жизни человечества.

(Мень А.прот. К истории русской православной библеистики. - Навстречу Христу. М: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. 372.)

n.284 При внимательном чтении можно почувствовать, что Библии присуще определенное единство, которое достигается не строгой архитектоникой, а иным путем. Весь пестрый конгломерат библейской поэзии и прозы пронизывают тонкие, но исключительно прочные нити, превращающие сборник книг в одну цельную Книгу. Роль этих связующих нитей, этого не сразу уловимого каркаса играют сквозные темы и образы, которые время от времени настойчиво повторяются в самом разном контексте.

(Мень А.прот., Мир библии – Как читать библию. Часть первая. М: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2005. 26.)

n.287 Подобно богослужению и иконе, Библия – это целый мир идей и образов, целый организм, впитавший в себя множество традиций.

(Мень А.прот. Исагогика: Курс по изучению священного писания: Ветхий завет. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2003. 42.)

n.292 ...традиционное название системы библ. дисциплин, к-рые методологически предшествуют экзегезе.

(Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый А-Й. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 561.)

n.305 Открытия, сделанные библейской наукой так закрепили позиции критики, что спор об ее выводах ныне перешел в область отдельных подробностей; что же касается прежнего, докритического подхода к Библии, то таковой уже немыслим.

(Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том второй. К-П. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 287. Карташев А.прот. Православие в его отношениях к историческому процессу. - Православный мысль, 1948, № 6, 140.)

n.309 ...есть самый естественный и правильный подход, конечно, при условии, если он руководим верою в Откровение....

(Мень А.прот. Исагогика: Курс по изучению священного писания: Ветхий завет. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2003. 46.)

n.320 ...для толкования Слова Божьего нужна вера, к-рая, в свою очередь, помогает постигнуть его смысл.... коренным субъективизмом, напоминающим произвол аллегорич. метода толкования.... наследия либеральной теологии....

(Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том второй. К-П. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 284-86.)

n.325 Первым и важнейшим из этих принципов стала ориентация на патристическое наследие. Вслед за отцами Церкви русские православные экзегеты рассматривали и рассматривают интерпретацию Библии как «труд веры», как познание слова Божия. Именно это имел в виду Святейший Патриарх Пимен, когда призывал изъяснять Писание «в духе святоотеческого толкования».

(Мень А.прот. К истории русской православной библеистики. - Навстречу Христу. М: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. 310.)

n.326 ...антологии из святоотеческих текстов.

(Мень А.прот. К истории русской православной библеистики. - Навстречу Христу. М: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. 311.)

n.327 Принцип богодухновенности означает, что и при любых исследованиях Библии человеческий фактор должен быть подчинен Божественному. В Православии существует определенная дисциплина ума, культура мышления в понимании Библии. Ее основной закон – Священное Писание может быть истолковано лишь в соответствии со Священным Преданием Церкви, в согласии с мнением святых отцов.... И это не просто какая-то «узость», «деспотизм» мысли, или требование ревнивого мракобесия. Это естественное следствие принципа богодухновенности Священного Писания. Святой Дух через пророков и апостолов составил священные книги. Святой Дух через святых отцов и истолковал их. Всякие библейские исследования, не имеющие признания со стороны Церкви, поэтому неосновательны. Они, так сказать, лишены свидетельства со стороны автора Библии – Святого Духа, пребывающего в Церкви.

(Антиминсов С.прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как комментатор священного писания. - Протоиерей Александр Мень как комментатор священного писания. Санкт-Петербург: Общество памяти игумении Таисии, 2006, 3-52, 5.)

n.329 Пример отцов Церкви открыл для русских библеистов возможность и необходимость творческого усвоения новейших приемов исследования, герменевтики, результатов исторических изысканий.

(Мень А.прот. К истории русской православной библеистики. - Навстречу Христу. М: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. 312.)

n.330 Сами Святые Отцы проделали огромную работу по исагогике Писания, уточняя подлинный текст, сравнивая переводы, решая проблемы авторов священных книг, в то время как эти книги уже давно были признаны каноническими.

(Мень А.прот. Два письма Владимиру Волгину: http://www.krotov.info/library/13_m/myen/2_1984volg.html. Second Letter, Part 2.)

n.331 ...он нередко опирался на отцов Церкви, но считал, что «единого святоотеческого учения нет, а есть святоотеческие системы и мнения, которые выбираются богословом по своему произволу». По его словам, «святоотеческий принцип скрывает разгул произвола толкователей».

(Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том третий. Р-Я. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 208.)

n.337 Современный читатель творений апологетов как бы становится участником

продолжающегося и в наши дни диалога между верой и неверием, и черпает новые силы, припадая к свежему источнику их вдохновения.

(Антология: Ранние отцы Церкви. Брюссель: Жизнь с Богом, 1988. 256.)

n.360 В сводном толковании были соединены изъяснения четырнадцати, или пятнадцати различных толкователей, которые разнились между собою и в направлении толкований, и в самом объяснении тех или других псалмов. Сверх того, между толкователями было несколько лиц, признанных в древней Церкви еретиками; других православие считалось, по крайней мере, сомнительным. Не в XVI в., и в другое время, православному читателю могло бы показаться странным, наряду с именами св. Василия В. И Иоанна Златоустово, видеть Ориген Аполлинария, Феодора мопсуестскаго.

(Горский А. Максим грек Святогорец at https://azbyka.ru/otechnik/Aleksandr_Gorskij/maksim-grek-svjatogorets/ [Accessed 20/09/2018].)

n.361 Мысль о богочеловеческом характере Священного Писания была сформулирована на I Конгрессе православных богословов в Афинах (1936), в частности в выступлениях представителей Элладской Православной Церкви, архимандрита Антониадиса и патриарха греческих библеистов проф. Василиоса Велласа. А представитель русских богословов Борис Иванович Сове..., говорил на Конгрессе следующее: «Механически буквальное понимание боговдохновенности священных книг - достояние иудейского и консервативного протестантского богословия - *не может быть защищено православными богословами как уклоняющееся в своего рода «монофизитство», а должно быть* исправлено в свете Халкидонского догмата о *богочеловечестве.* Участие в написании Библии человеческого элемента с его *ограниченностью* объясняет особенности ветхозаветных книг как исторических источников, их ошибки и анахронизмы, которые могут быть исправлены внебиблейскими данными, обогатившими, особенно в последние десятилетия, историю Древнего Востока. Ложный апологический взгляд на Библию как на энциклопедию исторических и общественных наук должен быть оставлен. Ветхозаветные боговдохновенные писатели - прежде всего богословы и законоучители. С этой точки зрения надлежит рассматривать учение о творении мира, о всемирном потопе и т.д. Ценность Библии в ее богословии». Тот же взгляд был высказан на торжественном Акте в Свято-Сергиевской Духовной академии (февраль 1944 года): «Поскольку и святоотеческая мысль утвердила положение о полноте действия естественной человеческой психики и об отражении ее в самих писаниях священных авторов, постольку догматически *оправданы* и узаконены те методологические операции над текстом и содержанием Библии, которые требуются научным знанием. Критическая работа тут уместна потому, что она прилагается к *подлежащему ее ведению человеческому элементу:* он здесь полностью дан. Дан, ибо Библия не только слово Божие, но и слово человеческое в их гармоническом сочетании, точнее - *слово богочеловеческое»* (А.В. Карташев. О ветхозаветной библейской критике. Париж 1947. С.72).

(Мень А.прот. Два письма Владимиру Волгину: http://www.krotov.info/library/13_m/myen/2_1984volg.html.

n.372 Вера моя в существенную истину и божественный (точнее: богочеловеческий) характер Св. Писания значительно выиграла в сознательности и отчетливости благодаря знакомству с новейшею библейскую критикою, преимущественно отрицательной школы.

(Соловьев В.С. Предуведомление – Собрание сочинений. Том одинадцатий. Брюссель: Foyer Oriental Chrétien, 1970. 73.)

n.374 Представим себе, что где-нибудь существовала литературная школа восторженных поклонников Шекспира, и что свою верную оценку исключительного гения и оригинальности шекспировского творчества эта школа основывала на совершенно неверных и даже нелепых предположениях, а именно будто весь материал шекспировских произведений создан непосредственно и всецело гением самого поэта, причем некоторая часть этой школы доходила даже до утверждения, что не только для сюжетов и лиц своих драм Шекспир не пользовался никакими готовыми источниками, но что даже все сочетания слов и все отдельные слова созданы им самим и каждое из них даже в отдельности своей исполнено его вдохновения. - Представим себе далее, что является новая литературная школа, критическая, и начинает сложными и обстоятельными исследованиями доказывать, что английский язык существовал и до Шекспира, что были на нем и литературные произведения, которыми этот поэт пользовался; затем доказывается, что все сюжеты и лица шекспировских драм взяты частью из разных хроник, частью из новелл, а частью и прямо из чужих драматических произведений, которые только переделаны Шекспиром; наконец, что многие из приписанных ему драм вовсе ему не принадлежат. Если бы теперь из всех таких добытых ею данных, большею частью совершенно верных, частью же сомнительных и преувеличенных, эта школа выводила бы то заключение, что у Шекспира совсем и не было никакого особого вдохновения и оригинального творчества, а некоторые представители этой школы стали бы даже утверждать, что Шекспир вовсе никогда не существовал и все приписанные ему драмы составлены позднейшими компиляторами, - то неужели нелепость таких заключений уничтожает пользу тех исследований, которые предприняты и тех фактических данных, которые добыты этою критическою школою?

(Соловьев В.С. Предуведомление – Собрание сочинений. Том одинадцатий. Брюссель: Foyer Oriental Chrétien, 1970, 73-74.)

n.375 Как в живом Логосе Божество нераздельно и неслиянно соединено с человечеством, также нераздельно и неслиянно соединены божественная и человеческая стихии в писанном Слове Божием. И как в Христе человеческая природа представляется не одною только внешностью, не одним только телом или плотью, но и разумною душою, - так и в Священном Писании элемент человеческий состоит не в одном только внешнем материале (письмен, языка и т. п.), а распространяется и на все содержание, обнимает самую душу и разум Писания.

(Соловьев В.С. Предуведомление – Собрание сочинений. Том одинадцатий. Брюссель: Foyer Oriental Chrétien, 1970, 75-76.)

n.377 ...грешить против Духа Святого, говорившего через пророков.

(Соловьев В. С. Когда жили еврейские пророки? - Собрание сочинений. Том седмой. Брюссель: Foyer Oriental Chrétien, 1970, 180-200, 200.)

n.381 ...только в своей целости, в своем завершении является носительницей божественного совершенства.

(The subject here is the ‘human’ element, which, although grammatically singular, is explained as the conglomeration of many different qualities, hence the plural translation.)

(Соловьев В.С. Предуведомление – Собрание сочинений. Том одинадцатий. Брюссель: Foyer Oriental Chrétien, 1970, 76.)

n.383 Церковь существовала и тогда, когда ни одной книги Священного Писания Нового Завета еще не было. Ведь книги Нового Завета написаны апостолами уже после: в течение более нежели полустолетия от начала исторического бытия Церкви. В написанных ими книгах апостолы оставили памятники своего устного благовествования. Они написаны для Церкви уже существующей.

(Мень А.прот. К истории русской православной библеистики. - Навстречу Христу. М: Жизнь с Богом, 2009, Иларион (Троицкий). Священное Писание и Церковь. М.: 1914. 17.)

n.386 Ветхозаветная Церковь живет всюду, где есть верные, исповедующие Творца и послушные Его воле.

(Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета: От эпохи Александра Македонского до проповеди Иоанна Крестителя. Книга I. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011. 288.)

n.387 Так среди сумерек многобожия возникла та точка в истории мира, которая должна была расти, расширяться и превратиться в конце концов в народ Завета, в народ Божий, в ветхозаветного предтечу Церкви.

(Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие. Религиозный путь человечества до эпохи великих Учителей. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. 180.)

...Яхве явил Свою волю и создал Свой народ, которому надлежало стать «царством священников и народом святых», т. е. Церковью.

(Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие. Религиозный путь человечества до эпохи великих

Учителей. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. 432.)

n.388 Наступило время, когда ветхозаветная Церковь должна была испытать свою устойчивость в чужом, языческом мире.

(Мень А.прот. Вестники Царства Божия. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2010. 275.)

n.389 Ветхозаветная Церковь стала бездомной странницей....

(Мень А.прот. Вестники Царства Божия. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2010. 348.)

n.390 ...после Плена ветхозаветная Церковь действительно в одном отношении жила как бы в согласии с предвидением Иезекииля. Кончилась полоса отпадений, идолы больше не смущали Израиль, храм и вера приобрели гораздо большее значение, чем прежде.

(Мень А.прот. Вестники Царства Божия. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2010. 330.)

n.391 ...ветхозаветная Церковь уже не ограничивалась пределами Палестины... роль метрополии в религиозной жизни по-прежнему оставалась ведущей.

(Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета: От эпохи Александра Македонского до проповеди Иоанна Крестителя. Книга I. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011. 167.)

n.393 «Будьте осторожны в суждениях,
Поставляйте больше учеников
И делайте ограду Торе.»

Смысл этих изречений, невзирая на их лапидарность, ясен. Толкование Закона требует большой осмотрительности; «ученики» - это те, кто целиком посвящает себя изучению Закона, а слова об «ограде» предостерегают против чуждых влияний. Под «Торой» в данном контексте, скорее всего, подразумевалось не только Пятикнижие, но и весь свод наставлений, входивших в устную традицию ветхозаветной Церкви.

(Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета: От эпохи Александра Македонского до проповеди Иоанна Крестителя. Книга I. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011. 169.)

n.395 Ветхозаветная Церковь, а за ней и новозаветная признали, что в этих книгах запечатлено то же божественное Откровение, что и в Торе и у Пророков. Этим утверждалось, что Слово Господне может быть дано людям в самых различных формах.

(Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета: От эпохи Александра Македонского до проповеди Иоанна Крестителя. Книга I. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011. 171.)

n.396 ...насколько сложной была жизнь ветхозаветной Церкви и как много было в ней независимых течений.

(Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета: От эпохи Александра Македонского до проповеди Иоанна Крестителя. Книга I. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011. 279.)

n.397 ...глубокая мудрость ветхозаветной Церкви.... высшее благо ограничено земными пределами....

(Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета: От эпохи Александра Македонского до проповеди Иоанна Крестителя. Книга I. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011. 233.)

n.399 ...Христос учил о Библии как о божественном Откровении и признавал необходимость живого церковного предания, которое раскрывало бы ее смысл. Именно поэтому Он говорил народу о фарисеях: «Все, что они скажут вам, исполняйте». Но если книжники часто прибавляли к Закону сотни мелочных правил, то Иисус возвращал Ветхий Завет к *его истокам*, к Десяти заповедям Синая, к подлинному Моисееву наследию, сохранненому пророками.

(Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2016. 104.)

n.405 ...один из крупнейших экклезиологов нашего столетия....

(Мень А.прот. Сила Церкви есть сила Христова. Беседа о миропомазании – Церковь и мы. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2015. 230.)

n.408 ...он с … святоотеческим и прочим материалом в руках показывает, что Церковь есть община *людей*, *посвященных Богу*, то есть святых, и Божие действие в ней (то есть действие Христово через Дух) совершается *всей* Церковью, ибо «вы – род избранный, царственное священство, народ святой» - мы все священники Бога Вышнего. Каково же роль клирика в этом? - Она служебная. Клирики есть органы Церкви, функционально созданные для совершения операционно-материальной части таинства....

(Мень А.прот. Церковь и мы. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2015. 230-231.)

n.409 Закладывая фундамент ветхозаветной Церкви, Моисей дал ей знамение общности – кровь пасхпльного агнца. В иерусалимском Храме жертвоприношение сохранило характер культового пиршества. Оно – как и обряд Пасхи – имело два аспекта: утверждение целостности народа Божия и веру в пребывание с ним Господа. В предновозаветную эпоху молитвенные трапезы вне Храма стали одним из важнейших обычаев иудейства. Они сопровождались чтением Библии и беседами о вере. Главной частью ритуала было благословение хлеба и вина, а также *благодарственная* молитва, в которой *вспоминались* благодеяния Божии, явленные в Священной Истории.

Хлеб и вино как символы братского союза упомянуты еще в библейском рассказе об Аврааме (Быт 14, 18).

(Мень А.прот. Таинство, слово и образ. Ленинград: Ферро-Логас, 1991. 36-37.)

n.414 ...заговорила сама ветхозаветная Церковь.

(Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета: От эпохи Александра Македонского до проповеди Иоанна Крестителя. Книга II. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011. 179.)

n.419 ...одна из мрачных страниц послепленной истории Иудеи.

(Мень А.прот. Вестники Царства Божия. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2010. 439.)

n.427 ...учения о Триединстве и Богочеловечестве родились из мистического прозрения, которое на несовершенном языке понятий принимает диалектическую, противоречивую форму.

(Мень А.прот. Истоки религии: Природа веры. Человек во Вселенной. Перед лицом Сущего. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011. 111.)

n.428 Перед антиномией свободы и Промысла ограниченный разум останавливается, будучи не в силах заключить бытие в рамки системы.

(Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета: От эпохи Александра Македонского до

проповеди Иоанна Крестителя. Книга I. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011. 216-217.)

n.429 ...не боялось антиномично выражать истины Откровения.

(Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета: От эпохи Александра Македонского до проповеди Иоанна Крестителя. Книга I. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011. 332.)

Chapter 3

n.434 Кто из богословов и писателей оказал на вас наибольшее влияние?

На первом месте я должен назвать Вл. Соловьева. Хотя многие его воззрения я не разделял, но он был моим настоящим учителем. А уже после него я изучал труды представителей русской религиозной философии. Бердяеву, Флоренскому, Булгакову, Франку, Лосскому и др. я очень многим обязан.

(Мень А.прот. О себе... М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2007. 214.)

n.436 ...как на историка религии, и как на библеиста, и как на религиозного философа, и как на духовного писателя, и как на поэта. Может быть, еще более важно то, что у отца Александра встречаются мысли, заимствованные у Соловьева, но усвоенные так давно и глубоко, что они воспроизводятся без ссылки на первоисточник.

(Предеин Д.прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как выдающийся православный катехизатор и миссионер второй половины XX века. Одесса: “Астропринт”, 2015. 99.)

n.439 ...показал, как естественно и органично смелый критический взгляд сочетается с глубочайшим проникновением в смысл библейского повествования и доктрины. Если бы меня спросили, кто лучше всего изложил основы библейского богословия, я сказал бы, что на русском языке до сих пор никого не было выше, чем Сергей Николаевич Трубецкой.

(Мень А.прот. Русская религиозная философия: лекции. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008. 84.)

n.440 ...предвосхитил многие идеи современных западных экзегетов.

(Мень А.прот. К истории русской православной библеистики. - Навстречу Христу. М: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. 373.)

n.451 ...очень часто в церковных кругах, православных и католических, либо боялись научной критики, критики текста, исследования вопроса о том, когда возникло то или иное произведение Ветхого или Нового Завета, исследования о том, является ли достоверным то или иное житие или древнее сообщение церковных историков, - либо, когда в конце концов этот консерватизм оказывался непереносимым, бросались в обратную крайность.

(Мень А.прот. Русская религиозная философия: лекции. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008. 73.)

n.452 Уже позже, зимой 1899-1900 гг., Гарнак прочел для студентов цикл лекций в Берлинском университете, который назывался «Сущность христианства».... В нем ученый выразил свое кредо. Однако эта книга, блестящая по форме и содержанию, оказалась неспособной выразить сущность христианства. Ибо Гарнак не мог вырваться из той гносеологической тюрьмы, в которую его бросил неокантианский скептицизм. Отсюда – игра словами, ибо для Гарнака те вещи, которые мы познаем таинственным, интуитивным путем, как бы исчезают; он понимал, что наука не знает и не может знать ответа на вопрос, для чего мы живем и почему существуют мир и человек. Но тем не менее он искал сущность в исторических фактах, что уже само по себе было порочно. Ибо сущность любого явления познается интуитивным созерцанием. История дает только набор фактов.

(Мень А.прот. Русская религиозная философия: лекции. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008. 75-76.)

n.458 ...Иисус существовал, Он воплотил в Себе идеал совершенной веры и был учителем высокой нравственности. Те, кто приобщился к Его опыту и Его учению, - подлинные христиане, но им надлежит отказаться от идеи Богочеловечества и других «догматических мудрствований».

(Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2016. 374.)

n.461 ...уникальным Человеком, приводящим людей к Богу, тогда как Толстой ставил Его в один ряд с другими учителями.

(Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2016. 374.)

n.465 Либеральным теологам хотелось отождествить благовестие Христово со своей концепцией «чистой религии»; между тем дальнейшее изучение Евангелий показало,

что «исторический Иисус» неотделим от Того, Кто открылся в опыте первохристиан как Богочеловек и Спаситель.

(Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2016. 375).

n.467 ...«Что следует считать исходной точкой христианства?».... «Иисуса Христа и Его Евангелие»

(Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том первый. А-Й. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 231-236, 232.)

n.469 ...источником нерушимой веры в торжество над смертью и вечную жизнь.

(Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том первый. А-Й. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 233.)

n.470 Между тем историч. исследования никогда не бывают абсолютно объективными. Факты, добытые историком, неизбежно им же интерпретируются. Интерпретировал их и Г. - в свете философии либерального протестантизма, что доказывает его «История догматов». В ней он изобразил развитие церк. и догматич. христианства как историю длительного упадка. Гностики начали «острую эллинизацию» Евангелия, к-рая завершилась в вероучительной метафизике, чуждой учению Христа, а иудею-латинский дух превратил Церковь в организованный институт. Только германский протестантизм сумел вернуться к Евангелию. Но в глазах Г. даже Лютер оказался слишком робким. «Надо, - писал он, - сохранить и продолжить то, что он начал», иными словами, «освободить» Евангелие от наносных пластов, фактически перечеркнуть двухтысячелетный опыт Церкви и обрести «простую веру», веру «в того Бога, Которого Иисус Христос называл Своим Отцом и Который является и нашим Отцом». Известная доля правоты в концепции Г. есть: церк. история содержит не только высокий христ. опыт, но и печальное наследие веков, когда нередко терялась связь с Евангелием. Однако, по Евангелию, Церковь есть древо, растущее из семени, и едва ли правомерно стремиться снова превратить его в семя. Г. прав, указывая на важность этического аспекта Евангелия, но он сводит к ничтожному минимуму его мистическое содержание, отрицая при этом законность богомыслящего и созерцающего разума. Вот почему, говоря о «сущности» христианства, Г. вынужден преимущ. трактовать факты истории.

(Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том первый. А-Й. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 233.)

n.479 ...дело греческого духа на почве Евангелия.

(Трубецкой С.Н. Этика и догматика. - Собрание сочинений Кн. Сергея Николаевича Трубецкого. Том II. М.: Тип. Г. Лисснера и Д. Собко, 1910. 139-168, 160.)

n.481 Общению с последним в 1890-1891 гг. С. Н. Трубецкой в значительной степени обязан своим интересом к проблеме возникновения христианства, которой он посвящает свою докторскую диссертацию «Учение о Логосе в его истории» (1900).

(Гайденко П.П. <Конкретный идеализм> С.Н. Трубецкого. - Трубецкой С.Н. Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 6.)

n.484 В древности метафизика первая восстала против языческого многобожия и проповедала единого духовного Бога свободною разумною проповедью. Она приготовила все просвещенное человечество древнего мира к разумному усвоению начал христианства и, вдохновленная духом Христовым, создала православную догму, христианский гнозис св. отец. Она развила эту догму в стройное здание и выражала в себе разумное и свободное сознание Христовой истины. Потом, когда в германской Европе эта догма, застыв в своей древней форме, явилась внешним, чуждым игом, метафизика первая освободила умы, направив их на самодеятельное и свободное исследование как природы, так и духа и религии.

(Трубецкой С.кн. Метафизика въ Древней Греціи. М.: Тип. Э. Лисснера и Ю. Романа, 1890. 30-31.)

n.487 ...указаны точки соприкосновения между разумом греческих мудрецов и верой христианских пророков и христианское богословие воспринимается как результат встречи двух различных, но шедших навстречу друг другу традиций, а не как чужеродная прививка к евангельскому христианству греческого натурализма, как то полагал Гарнак.

(Гайденко П.П. <Конкретный идеализм> С.Н. Трубецкого. - Трубецкой С.Н. Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 12.)

n.501 О своем служении людям Христос говорит как о битве с сатаной, с «князем мира» (Ин 12, 31; 14, 30; 16, 11). Не свидетельствует ли даже само это наименование о том, что сатана поистине *овладел* человеческим родом, который вместо Царства Божия превратился в царство дьявола? «Власть тьмы» Христос видит и в грехе, и в болезне, и в одержимости, и в смерти (Ин 6, 70; 13, 2; Лк 8, 28; 13, 16; 22, 31). Поэтому, врачуя души и тела, Он говорит о том, что полагает начало всеобщему избавлению от сатаны, который низвергается со своего престола (Лк 10, 18). Не отвлеченная моральная проповедь составляет сущность провозвестия Христова, а освобождение мира от власти сатаны и греха.

(Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие. Религиозный путь человечества до эпохи великих Учителей. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. 519-520.)

n.503 Эта смерть есть суд и осуждение миру, не вмещающему царства Божия, и вместе она есть искупление миру.... страдание Сына Божия есть обличение мира и вместе *жертва* за мир, *искупление* мира от суда.

(Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о логосе в его истории – Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 43-482, 474.)

n.515 Верно, что евангелие восторжествовало своей внутренней правдой, своим словом; но в этом слове чувствовалась и являлась сила (ἐξουσία). Верно, что евангелие проповедовало высшую правду и высшее добро; но эта правда сознавалась, как действительный суд, и добро, - как действительное спасение, как всесильное благо, которому самое физическое зло и смерть не могут служить внешней границей.

(Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о логосе в его истории – Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 43-482, 442.)

n.516 В церкви апостольской «Дух» был не учением или догматом, а центральным фактом религиозной жизни, реально испытываемой силой, явлением, которое *переживали* верующие в своем священном энтузиазме. Преизбыток этой силы раскрывался не только в глубине нравственного сознания, в вере возрожденного человека, но и в самой телесной жизни, во всех его *делах,* в делах милосердия и в *знамениях* – видениях, исцелениях, в пророчествах и других необычайных действиях и экстатических состояниях, действительность которых признавали все.

(Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о логосе в его истории – Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 43-482, 446.)

n.517 «Дела», которые Христос творит со властью..., суть не только «силы»... и знамения (каковы исцеления и изгнания бесов), а все Его дела, в которых Он уже для внешнего взгляда является как пневматик, следующий во всем Своему духу и вдохновению.

(Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о логосе в его истории – Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 43-482, 451.)

n.520 Знамения царства

(Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2016. 147-158.)

n.521 Вся мировая культура создана верующими людьми. Если уж кто и обеспечивал нравственный прогресс народов, так это были религии. Неправда, что религия есть

мрак: добро есть в любой религии и, между прочим, в христианстве.

(Кураев А. Александр Мень: Потерявшийся миссионер: http://ruskline.ru/analitika/2010/09/10/aleksandr_men_poteryavshijsya_missioner/ [Accessed 22/05/2019].)

n.523 Т. придавал большое значение подготовке к принятию Евангелия в дохристианском сознании, в связи с чем часто обращался к проблемам сравнит.-религ. Изучения Библии.... Первым из рус. Ученых он составил библиографию по истории религий....

(Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том третий Р-Я. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 269.)

n.525 Сущность христианства..., заключается прежде всего и главным, можно сказать, совершенным образом, в Личности Христа. Сама христианская церковь есть лишь откровение этой Личности в человеческом обществе, — Ее социальное тело.... я вижу в Ней божественное откровение....

(Трубецкой С.Н. Мнимое язычество или ложное христианство? - Собрание сочинений Кн. Сергея Николаевича Трубецкого. Том II. М.: Тип. Г. Лисснера и Д. Собко, 1910. 166-189, 157.)

n.527 Не подлежит никакому сомнению, что Христос не принес никакого нового метафизического, философского учения. Но в то же время Он едва ли может быть признан „этиком“ или „моралистом“ в общепринятом смысле слова. Давно замечено, что отдельные нравственные правила Христа, хотя и не в такой идеальной полноте и чистоте, находились частью в учении еврейских учителей и пророков, частью в морали языческих философов. Оригинальность нравственного учения Христа, его несравненная цельность и законченность обусловливаются тем единым и совершенно новым, чисто религиозным основанием, которое Он дал нравственной жизни, установив в Своем лице новое отношение к Богу и к миру.

(Трубецкой С.Н. Этика и догматика II: https://www.litmir.me/br/?b=559067&p=2 [Accessed 15/12/2018].)

n.529 ...к Откровению нельзя подходить как к застывшей реликвии, ибо оно неотделимо от живого духовного опыта конкретной личности.

(Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том третий Р-Я. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 269.)

n.532 Наука не решает вопросов веры... показать, как такие вопросы ставились и разрешались в истории.

(Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о логосе в его истории – Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 43-482, 412-3.)

n.534 Христос, как мы веруем, есть истинный Бог и совершенный человек по телу, душе и духу. Всякое отрицание или умаление его человеческого естества, какими бы благочестивыми намерениями оно ни прикрывалось, как бы ни было оно замаскировано,— есть докетизм,—ересь, осужденная Церковью. Евангелие сообщает много чудесного про земную жизнь Спасителя, Его рождение и воскресение, про то, как Он исцелял больных, воскрешал умерших, ходил по водам, умножал хлебы: Он мог бы сделать и безконечно больше. Но всего чудеснее для нас то, что *Он* алкал и жаждал, томился и страдал; что Он имел друзей между людьми и прослезился над умершим другом, которого Он, как Бог, был в силах воскресить; что Он тосковал в смертных муках. Всего чудеснее во всем Евангелии чудо, обнимающее все чудеса и заключающее в себе всю нашу надежду, тайну спасения нашего, это—то, что *Он был человек*. И потому всякое умаление или отрицание человеческого естества во Христе, всякая тень докетизма — является христианину ложью и маловерием, грехом против веры и против Христа.

(Трубецкой С.Н. Мнимое язычество или ложное христианство? - Собрание сочинений Кн. Сергея Николаевича Трубецкого. Том II. М.: Тип. Г. Лисснера и Д. Собко, 1910. 166-189, 172.)

n.536 ...страдающее богосознание....

(Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о логосе в его истории – Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 43-482, 256.)

n.538 Этот позднейший мессианизм, развивающийся со времен Маккавеев, значительно отличается от мессианизма Ветхого Завета, к которому он примыкает. Новозаветная проповедь царства во многих отношениях заключает в себе реформу современного ей мессианизма. Как всякая истинная реформа, она не есть простое разрушение старого, а его «исполнение». В известном смысле она есть *возвращение* к религиозному источнику закона – к тому богосознанию, которое было верою отцов и пророков и которое терялось в мертвенной ортодоксии книжников и учителей закона; и в то же время эта реформа есть *обновление*, поскольку Христос не ограничивается одним возвращением к пророкам или одним пророческим служением, но в полноте своего Богосознания признает Себя истинным Сыном Божиим, в котором царство Божие не только предвидится и не только полагается, как обетование или заповедь, но исполняется, осуществляется, приходит действительно в своей правде и силе.

(Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о логосе в его истории – Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 43-482, 237.)

n.539 Для того чтобы уразуметь исторически христианскую идею богочеловечества, чтобы понять религию Богочеловека, нужно обратиться к богосознанию пророков, а не к апокалиптическому учению книжников.

(Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о логосе в его истории – Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 43-482, 342.)

n.540 Из апокрифов видно, что авторы их рассматривали историю в духе *предопределения*. Таким образом они невольно сближались с астрологией и стоическим фатализмом – самыми популярными доктринами эпохи. Если в Апокалипсисе Даниила дух профетизма еще сохранен, то апокрифы зачастую оказывались уже вне рамок Писания.

(Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета: От эпохи Александра Македонского до проповеди Иоанна Крестителя. Книга I. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011. 332.)

n.541 Пророк борется с своим народом за Бога, и эта борьба происходит на общественном поприще проповеди обличения, учительства; но в своем сердце он борется также и с Богом за свой народ: Бог превозмогает и заставляет его говорить, когда он не хочет.... Там, где нет у пророка слова утешения, там он приносит свой плач.... В Боге – единственное высшее благо пророка и благо Израиля, его царство, его слава, его крепость и сила.

(Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о логосе в его истории – Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 43-482, 248-9.)

n.542 Огненный рубеж отделяет естественное, интуитивное богопознание от библейской теофании, от самоявления Бога в Ветхом Завете, от завершенного Богочеловеком Завета Нового.

(Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие. Религиозный путь человечества до эпохи великих Учителей. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. 13.)

n.543 ...Иисус возвращал Ветхий Завет к *его истокам,* к Десяти заповедям Синая, к подлинному Моисееву наследию, сохраненному пророками.

(Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2016. 104.)

n.546 ...это царство и есть союз, полное общение и соединение с Богом, которое осуществляется в Израиле лишь отчасти, но имеет осуществиться в нем вполне во славу избранного народа и в просвещение всех народов. Цель этого царства есть пришествие, раскрытие славы Божией или *реализация Бога на земле*. Если религия Израиля есть жажда Бога, которая утоляется в сознании Его, то Христос есть

оправдание этой религии, ее Мессия, – прежде всего как *воплощенное богосознание*....

(Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том третий Р-Я. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 270-1, Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о логосе в его истории – Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 43-482, 263-4.)

n.548 Царство Божие – царство истины и добра, правды и блага – есть конечная цель Бога в истории, конечная цель мира, заключающая в себе весь смысл мирового процесса, его разумное основание. Это царство, которое предвещали пророки как божественную необходимость, приблизилось и наступает действительно в новом откровении.

(Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том третий Р-Я. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002, 270, Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о логосе в его истории – Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 43-482, 233.)

n.549 Этапы раскрытия учения о Мессии рассмотренв в... [Учение о Логосе], которая является лучшим в русской литературе исследованием темы мессианизма.

(Мень А.прот. Вестники Царства Божия. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2010. 497з.42.)

n.550 ...как многопланового и динамич. учения, тесно связанного с идеей Царства Божьего.

(Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том третий Р-Я. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 270.)

n.551 Мессианская вера Ветхого Завета формировалась при сопоставлении реальной истории и идеала Помазанника. Через помазанника-царя, по словам С. Трубецкого, «осуществляется на земле Божия правда и сила, - сила и слава Израиля; он праведен, благочестив и могуществен по своему сану и званию, по своему помазанию. И, чем более выказывается несоответствие отдельных царей этому помазанию... тем более идеальное значение получает образ “истинного” Мессии, освободителя народа, царя правды и мира, которого ожидают все плененные и угнетенные, все плачущие и обиженные, вдовы и сироты, притесняемые сильными, верные, томящиеся под игом язычников».

(Мень А.прот. Исагогика: Курс по изучению священного писания: Ветхий завет. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2003. 271.)

n.553 ...пророков, священников, но главным образом царей.

(Мень А.прот. Вестники Царства Божия. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2010. 123.)

n.554 «Мессианизм ветхозаветных евреев, - справедливо подчеркивает С. Трубецкой, - нельзя назвать неподвижным догматом их веры».

(Мень А.прот. Вестники Царства Божия. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2010. 497з.42.)

n.557 ...бесконечно отделяет... от индивидуалистической, монашеской мистики средних веков с ее отрешением от земли, от человечества, а иногда и от церкви.

(Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том третий Р-Я. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 270. Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о логосе в его истории – Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 43-482, 248.)

n.558 Православная мистика вообще остается еще совершенно незатронутой областью для гносеологического исследования....

(Булгаков С.Н. Философия кн. С.Н. Трубецкого и духовная борьба современности (рецензия). “Вопросы Философии и Психологии”, 1909. Вып.1, январь: http://ivashek.com/ru/texts/philosophy-texts/802-filosofiya-kn-s-n-trubetskogo-i-dukhovnaya-borba-sovremennosti-retsenziya [Accessed 04/10/2018], 8.)

n.559 Следуя по пути, проложенному созерцанием, индийские брахманы приходят к тому же, к чему приходили все мистики, в какое бы время и в каком бы народе они ни жили. Яджнявалкья и Будда, Плотин и Ареопагит, Мейстер Экхарт и Григорий Палама, каббалисты и Николай Кузанский, Яков Бёме, Рейсбрук и множество других ясновидцев Востока и Запада с единодушием, которое невольно приводит в трепет, возвещают о том, что они познали, дойдя до самых пределов бытия.

(Мень А.прот. У врат молчания: Духовная жизнь Китая и Индии в середине первого тысячелетия до нашей эры. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. 80.)

n.563 Пророки первыми увидели несущееся вперед время, им открылась динамика *становления* твари.

(Мень А.прот. Вестники Царства Божия. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2010. 15.)

n.564 ...духовно-нравственным откровением единого Божества.

(Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том третий Р-Я. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 270.)

n.565 Израиль верил, что после покаяния Бог простит его и будет вечно пребывать среди Своего народа. Эта вера в Пришествие Сущего, в конечное Богоявление и была подлинной мессианской верой.

(Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том третий Р-Я. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 270.)

n.566 Историч. метод Т. проявился в том, что к еванг. проблематике Т. подходит только после подробного рассмотрения панорамы религ. жизни междузаветного периода.

(Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том третий Р-Я. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 271.)

n.569 В этой главе научно-критич. подход органически сплавлен с подходом богословским. Т. полемизирует с теми взглядами, согласно к-рым Евангелие есть лишь часть естественной эволюции древних верований. Как бы ни были значительны в учении Христа элементы ветхозав. Предания, само явление Христа было чем-то абсолютно новым, таинственным, непостижимым. Именно поэтому с самых ранних времен возникало столько разноречивых суждений о Нем. «Единственное в истории соединение личного самосознания с богосознанием, которое мы находим только в Нем и которое составляет самое существо Его, не может быть объясненно влиянием Его среды; наоборот, все Его отношение к этой среде объясняется именно этим центральным фактом Его сознания».

(Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о логосе в его истории – Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 43-482, 408, Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том третий Р-Я. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 271-2.)

n.571 ...самое богосознание Христа, хотя и недоступное в своей полноте нашему ограниченному пониманию, остается несомненной действительностью, от которой научная мысль может и должна отправляться....

(Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о логосе в его истории – Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 43-482, 412.)

n.572 Его самосознание вообще не похоже на самосознание других людей. Он не искатель

истины, а сама Истина. Он учит не от лица Бога, подобно пророкам, а только от Себя.

(Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый А-Й. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 403.)

n.573 Воплощение – это величайший призыв к миру, суд над ним.

(Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том третий Р-Я. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 272.)

n.574 То было, действительно, испытание, и немногие христиане могли бы поручиться за то, чтобы они выдержали его на месте современников Христовых. Ведь Кайафа христианской догматике не обучался и видел пред собою только человека; и Петр знал только о славном Мессии, не допуская мысли о Его страданиях.

(Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том третий Р-Я. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 272.)

n.576 ...все рассеялись и «соблазнились» о Нем....

(Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о логосе в его истории – Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 43-482, 410.)

n.578 *Современники Христа видели в Нем прежде всего человека, и в этом человеке они не узнали духовного образа того Отца, которого они внешним образом исповедовали.*

(Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о логосе в его истории – Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 43-482, 412.)

n.581 ...провозглашение новых отношений между Богом и человеком и новое Откровение о «существе Божием».

(Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том третий Р-Я. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 272.)

n.585 Синоптики не ставили себе задачи дать последовательное изображение событий, у Иоанна же цель эта, очевидно была.

(Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2016. 368.)

n.588 ...непреложный до конца мира, остается в полной силе лишь до пришествия царства, которое уже не пророчествуется, как прежде, до дней Иоанна Крестителя, а возвещается как не посредственно близкое.

(Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том третий Р-Я. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 272, Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о логосе в его истории – Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 43-482, 431.)

n.589 Тайна Царства заключена в его незаметном присутствии в мире уже с момента проповеди Христа. Оно есть суд миру здесь и теперь. Подчеркивая это, Т. Предвосхищает идею «осуществленной эсхатологии», сформулированную в зап. Богословия через 30 лет после смерти философа.

(Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том третий Р-Я. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 272.)

n.590 ...прежде всего представление о *жизни будущего века.*

(Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о логосе в его истории – Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 43-482, 429.)

n.591 Ввиду... все новейшие попытки уменьшить значение эсхатологического учения или даже вовсе выделить его из проповеди Иисуса представляются ложными уже с чисто исторической точки зрения. Историки и моралисты вольны не принимать этого учения, но ничто не дает им права на основании личных симпатий или антипаий вычеркивать из евангелия то, что им не нравится.

(Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о логосе в его истории – Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 43-482, 438.)

n.592 Званые имеют *войти* в него, оно *дается* им, как *дар* Божий или как *мзда*.... не только чисто субъективное духовно-нравственное благо, но и полнота жизни....

(Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о логосе в его истории – Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 43-482, 429.)

n.593 ...высшая цель мирового процесса, как реализация божественного порядка, реализация

Бога или божественной жизни на земле.

(Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о логосе в его истории – Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 43-482, 444.)

n.599 Мы не знаем, когда Отец открыл Ему Свою волю, но сама эта воля тесно связана с новым пониманием Мессии как Искупителя и Спасителя, прообразом к-рого было пророчество о Служителе Господнем (Ис 53).

(Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том третий Р-Я. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002, 273.)

n.600 Проникнутый Своим мессианизмом, Своею верою в Отца и сознанием Его промысла и всемогущества, Он осуждает всякий мирской страх; Он верит в чудо Божие и в царство Божие, как чудесно, внезапно наступающее. При таких условиях Его смерть могла представляться Ему нравственно необходимой, но она могла представляться Ему неизбежной. И это доказывается нам решительно всем, что мы знаем о Христе и о Его отношении к Своей жизни и смерти; так было до самого конца, как мы видим из Гефсиманского моления о чаше.

(Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том третий Р-Я. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 273. Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о логосе в его истории – Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 43-482, 479.)

n.601 Ждали могущественного Мессию и грозного Богоявления, а земля увидела Богочеловека, умаленного, принявшего земную «плоть и кровь»....

(Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2016. 184-5.)

n.606 Бытие Христа открывается апостолу не статическим, а в становлении. Сначала уничиженный, Он обретает мессианскую Славу в Воскресении; затем Его Слава распространяется на все мироздание, вплоть до последнего Дня, когда перед Ним склоняется все космические силы.

Когда же подчинено Ему будет все,
тогда и Сам Сын будет подчинен
Подчинившему Ему все,
чтобы Бог был все во всем.

Говоря иначе, Богочеловек (хотя Павел не употребляет этого слова) приведет природу и людей, с которыми Он породнен тесными узами, к тому неизреченному бытию, где Сущий царит безраздельно, - к Царству Божию.

(Мень А.прот., Первые апостолы. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. 246.)

n.609 Как Вы оцениваете богословие отца Сергия Булгакова? - В отце Сергии Булгакове я ценю прежде всего его идеи раннего периода: об очеловечивании природы, о творческом призвании человека, о необходимости реализовать Евангелие в жизни общества. Богат мыслями и его анализ апофатического богословия («Свет невечерний»), а также его трилогия. Но в основном его парижские работы кажутся мне многословными, стилизованными и гностическими. Он пишет о сокровенных вещах слишком прямолинейно, слишком катафатично. Эта гностика (включая и софиологию) мне чужда. Она висит в воздухе, не опираясь ни на Писание, ни на разум.

Наиболее чужды мне его апокалиптические мотивы. И идея земной теократии. Это была дань времени. Самое драгоценное в нем - идея синтеза, «цельного знания», которое охватывает все области познания, вообще размах его мышления. Софиология - ни его, ни другая - никогда меня не привлекала. Его опыт Софии может быть истолкован как искушение.

(Бычков С.С. Хроника нераскрытого убийства. М.: Русское рекламное издательство, 1996. 172.)

n.612 К сожалению, о. Александр не оценил и не акцентировал в должной мере метафизическую силу и эвристическую ценность этой соловьевской идеи-понятия. В разговорах со мною он сетовал – и притом небезосновательно – на чрезмерную оккультную перегруженность этой идеи у Соловьева. Хотя самого Меня всегда волновала именно “софийная” проблема сквозных и организующих смыслов природы, истории и человеческой души. Он относился с полной серьезностью к библейской – поставленной в Книге притчей Соломоновых – проблеме высшего, богоустановленного и всегда недосказанного “софийного” смысла вселенской и человеческой жизни.

(Рашковский Е.Б. Владимир Соловьёв и протоиерей Александр Мень в динамике истории российской – Соловьевские исследования. Выпуск № 2(30). 2011. 32-44, 39.)

n.613 Такой гигантский ум, безусловно, поднимал массу спорных вопросов. Он был уязвим, как каждый большой человек. Неуязвим только глупец, который говорит азбучные истины: дважды два четыре — как тут можно быть уязвимым? А тот, кто поднимает проблемы, конечно, уязвим! И на Булгакова обрушивается поток критики. Карловацкий зарубежный монархист пишет толстый том о софиологии Булгакова.... Сам я чужд этого учения, я никогда его не принимал, но я сознаю, что эта концепция имеет место как богословское мнение.... Даже парижский богослов Владимир Лосский, тогда еще молодой человек, искренний, который всегда был верен нашей Московской патриархии, включился в эту полемику и написал изобличительную книгу о софиологии Булгакова. Лосский потом сам стыдился этой книги.

(Мень А.прот. Русская религиозная философия: лекции. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008. 286-

287.)

n.614 На Западе его авторитет уступает авторитету Флоровского. Но он гораздо менее глубок и скорее смотрит назад, чем вперед.

(Умное небо: Переписка протоиерея Александра Меня с монахиней Иоанной (Ю.Н. Рейтлингер). М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008. 311.)

n.615 Я же отнюдь не отрицаю софиологии. Просто это выходит за пределы моего мышления, за рамки моего скудного опыта. И вообще у о. Сергия была великая любовь к догматическому богословию, а у меня к нему нет вкуса. Одна из причин – вполне элементарная. Я привык знать и помнить, как много тайн в мире природы. Естественно-научная закваска приучила меня к метафизической «скромности». Когда меня допрашивают, например, о Филиокве или о Непорочном зачатии, я спрашиваю: а знаем ли мы, как из белковых молекул образовалась жизнь или как происходит размножение летучих мышей? Нет. Так как же мы дерзаем «анализировать» подобные тайны? Где у нас инструмент для этого? Разум и логика? Но они здесь неприменимы до конца. Откровение? Но оно не говорит ясно об этих тайнах. Таким образом, догматические построения являются чем-то глубоко проблематичным. Я не знаю, на что опереться, когда попадаю в эту область. Более того, считаю свои знания в этой сфере недостаточными, чтобы судить кого-либо, тем более о. С. В сущности я вообще богословием занимаюсь для других. Я просто верю, что истина у Бога и она превосходит мое понимание, и она прекрасна. Мне лично этого достаточно (это касается, например, загадки зла). Мне нередко обвиняют в рационализме, между тем я от него весьма далек. И на первое место ставлю веру, веру, которая является для нас единоспасающей.

(Умное небо: Переписка протоиерея Александра Меня с монахиней Иоанной (Ю.Н. Рейтлингер). М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008. 306-7.)

n.616 ...покинувшего почву слепого доверия к традиции.

(Мень А.прот. Дионис, Логос, Судьба. Греческая религия и философия от эпохи колонизации до Александра. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. 191.)

n.622 ...в 1885-1886 годах, была написана работа С. Н. Трубецкого «О святой Премудрости Божией», которая считалась утерянной и была обнаружена лишь в наше время И. В. Басиным, Она, несомненно была инспирирована концепцией Соловьева – точнее, явилась попыткой построения альтернативного – более православного софиологического учения. Для Трубецкого София гностических сект была ложна и греховна именно потому, что бралась ими как принцип знания, гнозис – своеобразная рационалистически проходимая лестница спасения, но не как София вселенская – Церковь. Здесь уже фактически заданы перспективы онтологического рассмотрения Софии, которые будут впоследствии характерны и для Булгакова.

(Ваганова Н.А. Софиология протоиерея Сергия Булгакова. М.: Издательство ПСТГУ, 2011. 268-9.)

n.624 С одной стороны, она есть качество человеческого ума, с другой – она тождественна с «порядком», или «уставом», в частности с тем, что помогает царю управлять страной, а простому человеку – семьей и хозяйством.

(Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета: От эпохи Александра Македонского до проповеди Иоанна Крестителя. Книга I. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011. 173.)

n.625 ...она не есть результат субъективного умствования, - она была от начала у Бога; ею все создано, ею определяется начало и конец всего творения, ею Израиль ведется к своей провиденциальной цели. Она вытекает из «неисследимого разума» Ягве (Ис. 40, 28)....

(Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о логосе в его истории – Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994, 43-482, 290.)

n.626 ...у меня совет и правда, я разум, у меня сила, мною цари царствуют и повелители узаконяют правду... Бог создал меня началом путей Своих, первенцем Своих творений, искони. От века была я поставлена, от начала, прежде бытия земли. Я родилась, когда еще не было источников, обильных водой. Прежде чем водружены были горы, прежде холмов я родилась... Когда Он уготовил небеса, я была там, когда Он утверждал свод над бездною, когда Он укреплял вверху облака... Когда давал морю предел, чтобы вода не переступала устава Его, когда полагал основания земли, когда я была художницей и была радостью изо дня в день, играя перед Ним все время, играя на земном кругу, и радость моя была с сынами человеческими.

(Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о логосе в его истории – Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 43-482, 290-1.)

n.628 ...Мудрость, несомненно, гипостазируется, как особая мощь Божества.

...является провиденциальною силою в истории вселеннойи в истории Израиля точно так же, как в жизни индивидуального человека....

(Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о логосе в его истории – Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 43-482, 291.)

n.629 Бог создал мир одним своим Словом, одним своим Духом, одной своей Мудростью. Словом он вызвал его из небытия к бытию, Духом оживил его, Мудростью дал ему целесообразное устройство. И вместе Он сказал Свое слово человеку, дал ему от Своего Духа и от Своей Мудрости. Для верного Израиля Дух, Слово и Мудрость Ягве являются прежде всего реально переживаемыми фактами опыта.

(Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о логосе в его истории – Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 43-482, 292.)

n.630 ...есть свойство Божества, и если она изображается как первое из созданий Ягве, то даже там, где она, по-видимому, всего более отличается от Него, как в книге Премудрости, она изображается лишь как «дыхание Его силы» (7, 25): она не отличается от «неисследимого разума» Господня.

(Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о логосе в его истории – Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 43-482, 292.)

n.639 Сущность Премудрости связана с тайной *самораскрытия* Божества, которая является важнейшим пунктом библейского богословия. Утверждая безусловную надмирность Творца и Его непостижимость, Ветхий Завет в то же время знает и об Откровении Бога миру. Через это Откровение, или Самопроявление, Неизреченный становится познаваем для человека. Само миротворение есть уже такой акт выхода Бога из безмерной глубины сверхбытия. Вступая в Завет с людьми, приближая их к Своей полноте, Яхве открывает Себя твари. Глас Его, обращенный к пророку, огненный столп, небесная колесница, облако в Храме – все это символы Теофаний, делающие возможной богочеловеческую историю. Один из первых образов Богоявления в Библии – *Малеях Яхве*, Ангел Господень, который есть как бы Само Божество, но умаленное для того, чтобы стать доступным человеку. В дальнейшем этот конкретный образ сменяется в Библии тремя главными Теофаниями: *Словом, Духом и Премудростью Яхве.* Они составляют одно в Боге. Но в то же время мы видим, что Слово – это преимущественно Бог созидающий, Дух – Его животворная сила, а Премудрость – устроительница Вселенной.

(Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета: От эпохи Александра Македонского до проповеди Иоанна Крестителя. Книга I. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011. 182.)

n.640 В православной литературе это наиболее последовательное изложение учения о библейских Теофаниях.

(Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета: От эпохи Александра Македонского до проповеди Иоанна Крестителя. Книга I. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011. 400з.243.)

n.641 В одном случае мудрец даже прямо называет ее *Логосом,* Словом Божиим, но так же, как и в Притчах, здесь нет еще учения о Троице, а развиваются древние понятия о Славе и Ангеле Яхве как образах Богоявления во Вселенной.

(Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета: От эпохи Александра Македонского до проповеди Иоанна Крестителя. Книга II. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011. 117.)

n.642 Ведь судьбы людей – часть общих судеб мироздания, и вся Вселенная зиждется на воле

и замысле Творца. Поэтому автор Книги Притчей видит в Премудрости Божией силу, устрояющую Космос.

(Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета: От эпохи Александра Македонского до проповеди Иоанна Крестителя. Книга I. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011. 177.)

n.646 ...Писание достаточно ясно указывает на Премудрость как на нечто причастное Божеству.

...такое толкование покидает библейскую почву.

(Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета: От эпохи Александра Македонского до проповеди Иоанна Крестителя. Книга I. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011. 181-2.)

n.654 Однако во всех текстах, где Премудрость персонифицируется, как в других местах – Дух или Слово, трудно провести четкую линию межу между поэтическими образами, выражением древних религиозных представлений и прозрением нового Откровения. Учение о Премудрости, намеченное в главных чертах в ВЗ, перешло в НЗ, где в свете нового, совершенного Откровения домирная Премудрость, деятельная участница миротворения, отождествилась с Богом-Словом, Вторым Лицом Пресвятой Троицы, Которое изначала «было у Бога» и без Которого «ничто не начало быть, что начало быть» (Ин 1: 1-3; ср. Евр 1: 2; Откр 3: 14).

(Brussels Bible commentary on Proverbs 8: 22-31.)

n.655 И как завершением и целью творения и особым предметом участия в радости Премудрости было создание человека, образа и подобия Божия (Быт 1: 26-28; Притч 8: 30-31), так и целью воплощения Сына Божия является обожествление человечества, «спасение погибшего» (Мф 18: 11; Лк 19: 10), дарование жизни вечной и совершенной радости всякому верующему в Него (Ин 3: 16; 17: 13). Всем этим объясняется, что Отцы Церкви, начиная со св. Иустина-философа, узнают Христа в ветхозаветной Премудрости.

(Brussels Bible commentary on Proverbs 8: 22-31.)

n.657 Греческая метафизика является нам как связное, органическое целое. Изучая ее, мы усвояем ряд метафизических положений, которые, при сравнении с последующими открытиями умозрения, являются основными и вместе простейшими, элементарными. Поэтому изучение классической философии лежит в основании изучения философии вообще, в основании всякого правильного философского образования.

(Трубецкой С.кн. Метафизика въ Древней Греціи. М.: Тип. Э. Лисснера и Ю. Романа,

1890. 1. (Here changed to modern orthography).)

n.659 ...есть в нашем сознании нечто такое, что не объяснимо никаким опытом, ничем приходящим извне....

(Трубецкой С.кн. Метафизика въ Древней Греціи. М.: Тип. Э. Лисснера и Ю. Романа, 1890. 14. (Here changed to modern orthography).)

n.661 ...каждое явление, как отношение или действие, в силу самого закона относительности, необходимо предполагает нечто относящееся, являющееся, и таким образом, сознание человеческое в каждом отношении как бы выходить из себя в метафизическую область, в каждом явлении вступает в отношение с тем, что является. Только на этом зиждется истинная и вселенская непоколебимая вера в реальность мира, в реальность всего сущего; ибо без такой веры ни одно существо не могло бы отличить субъективного от истинного, подлинно сущего. Это основное убеждение в реальности сущего предваряет самое сознание и всецело его обусловливает. Но что такое сущее (*τί τὸ ὄν*)? - это-то и есть основной вопрос метафизики. Поэтому, если я говорю, что сущее есть явление, то я делаю утверждение столь же метафизическое, как и тот, кто утверждает, что сущее есть Бог, материя, дух или сила, ибо безусловная идея сущего, сама по себе, совершенно метафизика, что допускают все; вместе с тем она безусловно необходима, как очевидно показывает логический анализ.

(Трубецкой С.кн. Метафизика въ Древней Греціи. М.: Тип. Э. Лисснера и Ю. Романа, 1890. 5-6. (Here changed to modern orthography).)

n.663 ...субъект выходит из себя метафизически, всеобщим образом, в каждом акт своего восприятия, познания или сознания, в каждом акт жизни своей, во всяком своем отношении.

(Трубецкой С.кн. Метафизика въ Древней Греціи. М.: Тип. Э. Лисснера и Ю. Романа, 1890. 15. (Here changed to modern orthography).)

n.664 Я выхожу из себя метафизически, идеально.

(Трубецкой С.кн. Метафизика въ Древней Греціи. М.: Тип. Э. Лисснера и Ю. Романа, 1890. 23. (Here changed to modern orthography).)

n.666 ...вещество есть *явление,* и признавать это явление реальным, независимым от нашего ограниченного субъекта значит лишь видеть в нем объект всеобщего сознания, всеобщей чувственности, обусловленный субъектом высшего порядка.

(Трубецкой С.Н. Основания идеализма. - Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 594-717, 667.)

n.670 ...к новому пониманию внутреннего тожества объектов с субъектом.

(Трубецкой С.Н. Основания идеализма. - Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 594-717, 662.)

n.673 Западноевропейский мистицизм определяется, с одной стороны, философским неоплатонизмом, а с другой – положительными историческими данными христианства, - Евангелием Христа, Его личностью и церковными догматами. Христианство с его универсальным характером далеко не может определяться как религия «непосредственного» откровения и существенно отличается от всякого мистического гностицизма. Во всяком случае мистицизм нормируется в христианстве некоторыми основными положительными и объективными нормами (I Иоан. 4, 1-3). Но, несмотря на все эти различия, на Западе, как и на Востоке, одностороннее развитие мистицизма в своем стремлении достигнуть сверхчувственного, непосредственного познания сущего нередко вело одинаковым путем к аналогичным результатам.

(Трубецкой С.Н. Основания идеализма. - Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 594-717, 682.)

n.676 ...материализма, дуализма, отвлеченного монизма или монадологии....

(Трубецкой С.Н. Основания идеализма. - Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 594-717, 695.)

n.677 В действительности все соотносится, и «быть» значит относиться.

(Трубецкой С.Н. Основания идеализма. - Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 594-717, 696.)

n.678 Такая соотносительность обусловливает и форму, и содержание моего сознания как ограниченного существа, и вместе, в самом сознании этой соотносительности я выхожу за пределы моей субъективной индивидуальности и понимаю универсальное всеединство сущего. Ибо я логически связываю свои субъективные состояния с реальными вещами и процессами, независимыми от моего индивидуального «я».

(Трубецкой С.Н. Основания идеализма. - Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 594-717, 697-8.)

n.684 Абсолютное утверждает себя лишь в своем «альтруизме», т. е. утверждая *потенцию* своего другого и раскрываясь в его *действительности,* как конкретная, всесильная и вместе всеблагая, свободная воля.

(Трубецкой С.Н. Основания идеализма. - Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 594-717, 713.)

n.685 ...образ и подобие универсального, конкретного всеединства.

(Трубецкой С.Н. Основания идеализма. - Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 594-717, 710.)

n.686 ...такое определение заключает в себе логическое обоснование нравственной философии и религиозного гнозиса и соответствует требованиям религиозного сознания. Оно устраняет *дуализм,* противополагающий мир Божеству и ограничивающий Божество этим отвлеченным противоположением; и оно устраняет *пантеизм* с его смешением абсолютного и относительного бытия. Оно соответствует вере в личного Бога, ибо оно понимает абсолютное как конкретный субъект, сущий в себе самом для другого и заключающий в себе основание своего другого. Оно соответствует нравственной идее Бога, как бесконечной любви, ибо оно признает альтруизм метафизическим определением абсолютного сущего. Оно понимает вселенную в ее универсальном детерминизме и вместе в свободе ее реального инобытия, в свободе ее внутреннего самоутверждения.

(Трубецкой С.Н. Основания идеализма. - Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 594-717, 716-7.)

n.691 Трубецкой понимал, что путь к реальности для человека не закрыт. В этом отношении у него было серьезное расхождение с Гарнаком. Он пишет несколько работ, посвященных особенностям человеческого познания и обоснованию идеализма, как он его понимал. Не принимая скептической точки зрения неокантианцев, он в то же время показывает, что концепция, которая была развита начиная с XVIII в. и согласно которой человек (познающий субъект) как бы совершенно одинок, весь мир ему противостоит, - это ложное воззрение.... Трубецкой в целом ряде работ стремился показать, что человек складывает свои представления, теоретические и рациональные, только благодаря тому, что он имеет контакт с мышлением других субъектов, что он не одинок, что он вовлечен в некий поток целого.

(Мень А.прот. Русская религиозная философия: лекции. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008. 76-77.)

n.694 Соборность мышления, соборность человечества, соборность народа.

(Мень А.прот. Русская религиозная философия: лекции. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008. 79.)

n.695 ...органической живой и постоянной взаимосвязи, в обмене, в диалоге с другими культурами.

(Мень А.прот. Русская религиозная философия: лекции. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008. 78.)

n.699 Первое толкование освобождает нас от рабства перед буквой, второе – утверждает «событийность» Падения, третье – связывает несовершенство мира с грехом и свободой, четвертое – рассматривает Падение в контексте мировой эволюции.

(Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие. Религиозный путь человечества до эпохи великих Учителей. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. 537.)

n.700 Антропоморфные и натуроморфные образы Писания указывают на кенотический характер теофании и самого О. Толкуя Библию, св. Отцы постоянно подчеркивали, что условный язык Писания не притязает на абсолютно точное изображение Божеств. Реальности.

(Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том второй К-П. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 322.)

n.707 ...Библия рисует космогенез как восхождение по ступеням от низшего к высшему, от неорганического к человеку: этот процесс совершается *опосредствованно.* В Книге Бытия Бог не представден «демиургом», мастером, формирующим изделия своими руками. Он придает творческую силу природным стихиям, «земле» и «воде», и те уже как бы спонтанно производят растительную и животную жизнь.

(Мень А.прот. Истоки религии: Природа веры. Человек во Вселенной. Перед лицом Сущего. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011. 123-4.)

n.713 ...быть живым – значит быть свободным.

(Brussels Bible commentary on Genesis 2:7.)

n.716 Будучи реально одним из множества существ в природе, - человек, в сознании своем имея способность постигать разум или внутреннюю связь и смысл (Логос) всего

существующего, является в идее как все, и в этом смысле есть второе всеединое, образ и подобие Божие. В человеке природа перерастает саму себя и переходит (в сознании) в область бытия абсолютного.

(Мень А.прот. Истоки религии: Природа веры. Человек во Вселенной. Перед лицом Сущего. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011. 160. Соловьев В.С. Чтения о Богочеловечестве – Собрание сочинений. Том третий. 149.)

n.723 ...следствие надлома и поврежденности всего духовного организма человечества.

(Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие. Религиозный путь человечества до эпохи великих Учителей. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. 551.)

n.736 Христианское богословие слагалось в борьбе с ересями. Еврейская религиозная мысль развивалась в упорной и тяжелой борьбе с язычеством – иноземного и отечественного происхождения.

(Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о логосе в его истории – Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 43-482,

278.)

n.743 Теоретически возможна макромутация, которая сразу отделила особь Homo Sapiens от естественного материнского ствола.

(Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие. Религиозный путь человечества до эпохи великих Учителей. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. 538.)

n.746 Когда в иудаизм проникли влияния греческой философии, появились попытки осмыслить это ветхозаветное видение единого человека в умозрительной форме. Филон истолковал Адама в духе платонизма, называя его «идеей» человека.

(Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие. Религиозный путь человечества до эпохи великих Учителей. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. 539-40.)

n.760 ...интуиция *общности человеческой природы* и интуиция свободы как начала греха.

(Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие. Религиозный путь человечества до эпохи великих Учителей. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. 543. Трубецкой Е.Н. Смысл жизни – Сост. А.П. Полякова, П.П. Апрышко. М.: Республика, 1994. 153.)

n.764 Четыре ангела — это образ, заимствованный из Книги пророка Захарии, где говорится о четырех ангелах, стоящих у престола (Зах 6,5); они, по числу стран света, обозначают полноту духовного мира. Прежде чем наступят дни скорби, печатью запечатлеваются все избранные, иными словами — священный остаток. Остаток — это термин, взятый из Ветхого Завета, обозначающий малое стадо среди народа Божьего. В Книге пророка Иезекииля говорится о том же самом — приходит бедствие, но Ангел ставит печать, «тав», на челах людей (Иез 9,4-6). Обратите внимание на удивительное, таинственное совпадение. В современном еврейском квадратном шрифте буква «тав» напоминает русское «п», но в древних алфавитах — в ханаанском и финикийском — буква «тав» выглядела как крест — либо как крест св. Андрея, либо просто как крест, как во всех финикийских надписях.... У древних христиан знак «тав», вероятно, и стал первым знаком осенения себя крестным знамением и осенения верующего во время крещения святой водой, то есть он был знаком Христа, и мало кем замечена его связь с удивительным прообразом пророка Иезекииля. Здесь тот же самый символ. Среди бури и смятений мира избирается малое стадо, в котором на каждом — печать крещения, и не просто печать крещения, но печать следования за Агнцем.

(Мень А.прот. Читая апокалипсис. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011. 78-79.)

n.767 История христианства не может быть прямолинейным и спокойным течением, ибо доныне открыты пропасти Бездны и доныне сохраняется свобода противиться делу Христову. Поэтому как путь Богочеловека шел через Крест, так и Церковь Его идет через Крест.

(Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие. Религиозный путь человечества до эпохи великих Учителей. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. 582.)

n.771 Нигилисты прошлого века глумились над Апокалипсисом, называя его «произведением сумасшедшего». Могли ли они предполагать, что эпоху, которую они так ждали, придется описывать терминами этой провидческой книги?

(Мень А.прот. Истоки религии: Природа веры. Человек во Вселенной. Перед лицом Сущего. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011. 198.)

n.774 С одной стороны, защиту отцом Александром хилиастических позиций можно считать проявлением некой специфической особенности – всегда присущего футуристического оптимизма в отношении необъятных перспектив христианства в земной истории.... Но нельзя не заметить, что отец Александр в некотором смысле пошел дальше их обоих в поддержке этой доктрины. Сравнительно с достаточно неопределенным и мечтательным хилиазмом Соловьева и Булгакова, который колебался между премилленаризмом и постмилленаризмом, вера отца Александра в правоту хилиазма имеет намного более конкретную, утвердительную, даже страстную форму.... Ответственно причислить хилиазм отца Александра к премилленаризму или постмилленаризму не представляется возможным, поскольку сам факт последнего Страшного Суда, который, например, отцом Сергием Булгаковым a priori признавался в самой традиционной форме, у отца Александра получает несколько абстрактную

интерпретацию.... Парадоксально, но факт: некоторые эсхатологические тексты Священного Писания, которые большинство Святых Отцов понимали иносказательно (первое воскресение, тысячелетнее Царство Христово), отец Александр предпочитал понимать буквально, а в том, в чем Святые Отцы видели буквальный смысл (Страшный Суд, вечная огненная геенна), отец Александр допускал возможность аллегорического истолкования.

(Предеин Д.прот. Протоиерей Александр Мень как выдающийся православный катехизатор и миссионер второй половины XX века. Одесса: “Астропринт”, 2015. 156-159.)

n.779 Апокалипсис – это откровение Божье, значит, мы должны за его символами и формами прочесть слово Божье, обращенное к нам.

(Мень А.прот. Читая апокалипсис. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011. 200.)

n.782 Таково происхождение хилиазма....

(Трубецкой С.Н. Учение о логосе в его истории – Сочинения. М.: Мысль, 1994. 43-482,

322.)

n.785 ...грубого материалистического *хилиазма.*

...в этой безыскусной картине мы узнаем ту мечту, которая в современной секулярной мифологии именуется «светлым будущим» и бесконечным прогрессом.

(Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета: От эпохи Александра Македонского до проповеди Иоанна Крестителя. Книга I. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011. 340.)

n.790 Общепринятого толкования в Церкви нет, поэтому пророчество о тысячелетнем царстве не раз питало идеи хилиазма.

(Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том второй К-П. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 326.)

n.800 О. Сергий Булгаков предполагает, что прежнее творение сохраняется, но оно преобразуется. Эта мысль близка нашему православному сознанию. Но многие современные библеисты считают, что речь идет о полной ликвидации старого творения и создании нового. Они строго следуют букве и думают, что буква подсказывает им именно такое решение. Для нас же важно, что самый принцип бытия, та Премудрость,

которая была заложена в мироздании, - все это, конечно, не творится заново, а преобразуется, следовательно, мы можем говорить о том, что основное в творении не погибает.

(Мень А.прот. Читая апокалипсис. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011. 215.)

Chapter 4

n.806 Подобно богослужению и иконе, Библия – это целый мир идей и образов, целый организм, впитавший в себя множество традиций.

(Мень А.прот. Исагогика: Курс по изучению священного писания: Ветхий завет. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2003, 42.)

n.811 ...культ есть гармонизация, одухотворение наших чувств, аффектов.

Если вступить на путь борьбы с аффектами, - пишет он, - то придется в корне отринуть самую природу человека... Вступить в борьбу с аффектами значит одно из двух: если она неуспешна – отравить человечество «загнанными внутр страстями», если же удачна – оскопиться и умертвить человечество, лишив его жизненности, силы и, наконец, - и жизни самой. Культ действует иначе; он утверждает *всю* человеческую природу со всеми ее аффектами....

(Флоренский П.А. Из богословского наследия – Богословские Труды. Сб.17. М. 137, Мень А.прот. Таинство, слово и образ. Ленинград: Ферро-Логас, 1991. 10.)

n.812 Слова молитв, гимны благодарения и покаяния, которые вылились из глубины сердца великих поэтов, мистиков, святых, боговидцев, драгоценны для нас. Вживание в них есть школа души. Оно воспитывает нас, просветляет и возвышает. Но в храме не только «слово» служит средством для этого просветления и очищения, но и «образ»: икона, мелодия, ритуальный жест, архитектура храма. Флоренский недаром назвал церковное действо «синтезом искусств». В своей полноте оно обращено ко всем сторонам человеческой личности.

(Мень А.прот. Таинство, слово и образ. Ленинград: Ферро-Логас, 1991. 10-11.)

n.814 Исторически христианский храм был преемником синагоги, служившей «домом собрания», местом молитвы, проповеди и чтения Слова Божия.

(Мень А.прот. Таинство, слово и образ. Ленинград: Ферро-Логас, 1991. 15.)

n.816 *Собор всей твари* как грядущий мир вселенной, объемлющий и ангелов, и человеков, и всякое дыхание земное, - такова основная храмовая идея нашего древнего религиозного искусства, господствовавшая и в древней нашей архитектуре, и в живописи.

(Трубецкой Е.Н. Смысл жизни – Сост. А.П. Полякова, П.П. Апрышко. М.: Республика, 1994. 228.)

n.821 ...никакие слова не в состоянии передать красоты и мощи этого несравненного языка религиозных символов.

(Трубецкой Е.Н. Смысл жизни – Сост. А.П. Полякова, П.П. Апрышко. М.: Республика, 1994. 225.)

n.822 ...условной иллюстративности к многогранному богосл. символизму.

(Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый А-Й. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 512.)

n.824 Чистые краски, певучие линии, необычная перспектива и композиция рождали у созерцающего икону особое состояние. Он приобщался к вечной красоте, к реальности, открытой мистическому взору.

(Мень А.прот. Таинство, слово и образ. Ленинград: Ферро-Логас, 1991. 16.)

Икона не хочет подражать натуре. Она передает внутреннюю сущность явлений духа.

(Илюшенко В.И. Отец Александр Мень. Жизнь, смерть, бессмертие. М.: Эксмо книгоноша, 2013. 393.)

n.825 ...в каком-то смысле богослужение есть священный театр, и священник – артист....

(Умное небо: Переписка протоиерея Александра Меня с монахиней Иоанной (Ю.Н. Рейтлингер). М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008. 98.)

n.827 Многие теперь (реставраторы и пр.) вполне овладели техникой «темперной живописи», но для них это в целом, так сказать, «искусство для искусства». Подлинная же храмовая живопись никогда такой не была. За ней всегда стоял дух, идеи, искания, церковное

творчество. Это-то и ценю я в Ваших работах.

(Умное небо: Переписка протоиерея Александра Меня с монахиней Иоанной (Ю.Н. Рейтлингер). М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008. 48.)

n.828 Я думаю, что Ваше творчество внесет определенный вклад в современные и очень существенные поиски новых форм в искусстве. Тут ведь проблема на проблеме. И о реа-символизме Вы очень хорошо сказали. Ведь в самом деле тут не одна условность, а «образ».

(Умное небо: Переписка протоиерея Александра Меня с монахиней Иоанной (Ю.Н. Рейтлингер). М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008. 69.)

n.831 Иконы, написанные о. Александром, -- это национальное достояние, очень значительное духовное явление в иконописи.... пронзают тем, что святые, изображенные на них, -- абсолютно живые, вошедшие в его жизнь: апостол Павел, архангел Михаил – святой покровитель его сына и св. Иоанн Предтеча (последняя икона находится постоянно в часовне Усекновения главы Иоанна Предтечи, построенной на месте гибели о. Александра, похороны которого состоялись именно в день Усекновения главы святого, 11 сентября – ред.)

(http://www.blagovest-info.ru/index.php?ss=2&s=4&id=60150 [Accessed 21/04/2019].)

n.833 Деление на «светское» и «религиозное» в искусстве было для отца Александра очень спорным и очень сомнительным.

(Илюшенко В.И. Отец Александр Мень. Жизнь, смерть, бессмертие. М.: Эксмо книгоноша, 2013. 228.)

n.839 Для меня в изобразительном искусстве имеет значение и интерес то, что невозможно передать на вербальном уровне.

(http://www.ncca.ru/events.text?id=12 [Accessed 20.04.2019].)

n.841 Образ Христа в фильме Дзефирелли считается у кинокритиков одним из самых удачных.

(Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том второй К-П. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 54.)

n.844 Многие иллюстрации, которые мы находим в бесчисленных изданиях Библии или Нового Завета, к сожалению, лишены той силы и значительности, которые соответствовали бы своему великому сюжету. Художник, рисунки которого помещены здесь, - одно из счастливых исключений не только в русской, но в мировой графике. Он глубоко прочувствовал, пережил то, что изображает. Его рисунки свободны от вульгарного «реализма» и увлечения новейшими зкспериментами. При этом их отличает удивительная одухотворенность. Хочется верить, что они по-настоящему помогут читателю полнее приобщиться к миру евангельских образов.

(Мень А.прот. Спаситель. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2005. 2.)

n.845 Великие творения – подобно пророчеству – нередко появлялись в годы духовного упадка, и в то же время годы подъема веры в сфере И. и. не всегда были плодотворны.

(Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый А-Й. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 491.)

n.847 Дали знал трагичность жизни. Понимал, что Хаос скрыт не только в бездне, но и в человеке. Безжалостно вскрывая мир подсознания, художник показывал Хаос, который шевелится в его сумрачных закоулках.

(Мень А.прот. Мрак и свет: https://www.slovosnami.narod.ru/AMen.htm [Accessed 06/04/2019].)

n.854 Его фильмы не только продукт мастерства, а своего рода исповедь, смелый опыт символической автобиографии.

(Мень А.прот. Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008. 159-160.)

n.857 Наиболее остро проблема веры поставлена в библейской традиции, которая явилась питательной почвой для всей европейской культуры. Библия не стремится к «объяснению всего». Для нее вера не просто логика, теория о космическом Разуме и не концепция, призванная лишь объяснять свойства природы и человека. Евангелие, составляющее вершину Библии, возвещает о реальности Контакта и о вселенском свершении, к которому этот Контакт направлен. Согласно христианскому видению, у Вселеннойи у человека есть цель – приближение к своему Первообразу, к Творцу. И эта цель достигается на путях любви к Богу и к людям. Апостол Павел говорит, что если человек познал все тайны и совершил немыслимые подвиги, но не имеет любви, - он «медь звенящая». Эти слова звучат в фильме Тарковского «Андрей Рублев». И не случайно, что в «Солярисе» мы видим рублевскую «Троицу» на борту космической станции. Творение русского иконописца есть величайший символ божественной

Любви, той любви, которая, по слову Данте, «движет Солнце и светила».

(Мень А.прот. Трудный путь к диалогу. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2008. 167.)

n.862 ...ценным вкладом в библ. науку, а также и в общую герменевтич. теорию....

(Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том третий Р-Я. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 429.)

n.863 Интерпретатор должен учитывать, что текст Библии и любого другого памятника зависит как от особенностей его языка, так и от личных особенностей автора. Эти два фактора создают «напряженность», они и противоборствуют друг с другом, и дополняют один другого. Процесс понимания носит творческий характер, требует интуитивного вживания в текст и одновременно его анализа. Герменевтика предполагает род экзегетич. Искусства. Она помогает увидеть в тексте глубинные пласты, к-рые, быть может, не до конца осознаны даже самым автором. «Грамматическая» экзегеза ориентируется на законы языка, «психологическая» направлена на особенности того или иного автора.

(Мень А.прот., Библиологический словарь. Том третий Р-Я. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 430.)

n.869 Быть может, разница в богопознании религиозных гениев, таких, как Франциск Ассизский, Мейстер Экхарт, Серафим Саровский, и людей обыкновенного уровня заключается в том, что для последних встреча с Богом подобна мгновенной вспышке молнии, за которой нередко вновь наступает мрак, а первые всем своим существом приобщались Божественной жизни и сами становились ее носителями.

(Мень А.прот. Истоки религии: Природа веры. Человек во Вселенной. Перед лицом Сущего. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011. 94.)

n.873 Религия, искусство, этика скорее *живут* в человечестве, чем развиваются в эволюционном смысле.

(Мень А.прот. Магизм и единобожие. Религиозный путь человечества до эпохи великих Учителей. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. 544.)

n.876 ...лишь мертвенной пародией на подлинное творчество....

(Мень А.прот. Истоки религии: Природа веры. Человек во Вселенной. Перед лицом Сущего. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011. 169.)

n.895 Четвероевангелие отличает удивительная строгость и лаконичность, подчас граничащая с документализмом. Выразительные средства евангелистов скупы, морализирующие комментарии отсутствуют.

(Мень А.прот. Библиологический словарь. Том первый А-Й. М.: Фонд имени Александра Меня, 2002. 384.)

n.898 Кого изобразил французский беллетрист? Слабого человека, легко подверженного влияниям, жившего иллюзиями и наивными доктринами давно прошедших дней.... Невозможно себе представить, чтобы герой этого романа положил начало великой мировой религии, изменившей ход истории.

(Мень А.прот. В поисках подлинного Христа – Библия и литература. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. 368-415, 383-384.)

n.903 Проследив попытки реконструкции евангельской истории в XVIII-XIX веках, Швейцер убедился, что беллетристы и историки в равной степени были субъективны. Каждый из них видел в Евангелии только то, что хотел, что подсказывали ему его воззрения.... Сам же Швейцер не устоял перед искушением и в конце книги дал собственную версию жизни Христа, недалеко ушедшую от «либеральной», против которой он ополчался.

(Мень А.прот. В поисках подлинного Христа – Библия и литература. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. 368-415, 395-396.)

n.908 Что испытал Сын Человеческий, когда лежал на холодной земле в томлении духа? Мог ли то быть лишь естественный страх перед пытками и смертью? Но ведь его побеждали и более слабые. Почему же поколебался Тот, Кто будет опорой для миллионов? Нам не дано проникнуть в глубину смертного борения....

(Мень А.прот. Сын человеческий. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2016. 262.)

n.915 ...неодолимая духовная сила....

(Мень А.прот. На пороге Нового Завета: От эпохи Александра Македонского до проповеди Иоанна Крестителя. Книга II. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2011. 266.)

n.917 Все теряются в догадках....

(Мень А.прот., Первые апостолы. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. 84.)

n.918 Он был человеком энциклопедических знаний и, конечно, мог, что называется, задавить аргументами, но отец делал иначе. Он как бы подводил меня и мою сестру к правильному выводу, предлагал прочитать ту или иную книгу, статью, посмотреть фильм, а затем его уже обсуждал с тобой. Это очень важная его черта, он исползовал ее со своими прихожанами.

(Мень М.А. “Чтобы умереть было не стыдно” - Новые заветы: самые известные люди России о своих мечтах, страхах и успехах. М.: “Русский пионер”, 2016. 362.)

Conclusion

n.926 Пафос современного материализма, его иррациональный подтекст – это безоговорочный атеизм, отрицание любых сверхчеловеческих сил. Античный же материализм покоился на древнеязыческих верованиях. Этот материализм представлял собой философский вариант гомеровской религии с ее идеей Рока и телесными богами. С другой стороны, учение Демокрита было продуктом разложения натурфилософии, признаком ее глубокого кризиса, который, впрочем, греческая мысль скоро преодолела. В то самое время, когда учил Демокрит, в Афинах уже появился Сократ, заставивший людей по-новому взглянуть на себя и на мир. Впоследствии Платон ни разу не упомянул Демокрита в своих книгах. Материализму оставалось отойти в тень и ждать своего часа, чтобы в очередной критический момент вновь заявить о себе.

(Мень А.прот. Дионис, Логос, Судьба. Греческая религия и философия от эпохи колонизации до Александра. М.: Жизнь с Богом, 2009. 165-6.)

Annex 2: The Letters of Sergei Trubetskoi to Adolf von Harnack (1891-1894)

The materials included here relate primarily to Chapter 3.3 of the study.

Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin (A.v. Harnack/ IIIA Nr. 236)

Letter 1 (Beginning of stay in Kreuznach, July 1891)

This letter is dated 1891 with two numbers, a seven and a three next to it. Although it is not clear what these numbers refer to, 3rd July would be a plausible date for the letter, following Trubetskoi's stay in Berlin from November 1890 to March 1891. During this period he had studied with Harnack, even spending time with his family.[2] It is entirely plausible that he initiated correspondence with Harnack during further travels around Germany after March 1891, before returning to Russia in September.

1891 3,7 Kreuznach Hôtel du Nord

1.1) Nous venons d'arriver à Kreuznach, après un long sejour à Dinard. Ma femme et mes enfants vont bien, Dieu merci, et nous espérons bientôt revenir en Russie et vous voir en passant par Berlin. Je profiterai avec grand plaisir de notre sejour à Kreuznach pour visiter Giessen et Marburg, quoique j'ai bien peur de n'y trouver personne ce mois ci. Et c'est pour cela que je m'adresse à vous, cher Monsieur, en vous priant de me donner l'adresse de quelques uns de vos collègues que je puis espérer trouver pour le moment. Vous seriez bien bon et bien

2 Ермишин О. Т. Князь С. Н. Трубецкой. Жизнь и философия: биография. М.: СИНАКСИС, 2011, 16-17.

aimable de me donner ces renseignements, car j'ai vraiment besoin de voir des théologiens et des philosophes protestants. Les ténébres enveloppants des questions de première importance s'eppaississent autour de moi à chaque pas, et je compte sur vous pour m'éclairer, parce que c'est vous qui m'avez le plus expliqué le génie historique du protestantisme. Mais le resultat auquel j'arrive me parait étrange et je vous le confesse avec une certaine crainte. Il me semble que la solution on plutôt l'explication des contradictions éternelles du protestantisme est celle-ci – qu'il est toujours et nécessairement inconséquent et partout divisé. Il me semble que vous avez raison contre vos “conservatifs” et qu'eux aussi ont raison contre vous; presque tous les partis ont logiquement, historiquement raison. Je dirai même dass sie Kirchengeschichtlich recht haben. Je sais bien que la conception du christianisme de notre église ou bien celle de l'église romaine impliquent des contradictions qui nous démontrent leurs imperfections. Et plus elles sont poussées à bout, plus elles sont conséquentes, moins elles paraissant chrétiennes. Mais les contradictions m'entravent pas leur unité intérieure. C'est plutôt la logique des choses, l'orthodoxie conséquente qui produit des schismes. Quant au protestantisme – il ne peut par sa nature avoir des schismes; ou plutôt tous ses schismes sont des divisions intérieures. Mais jusqu'a présent et dans toutes ses divisions le protestantisme chretien me semble encore moins conséquent que les deux églises catholiques. Et cela pour cause, que s'il voulait être conséquent, il serait moins chrétien. L'expérience d'ailleurs en a souvent été faite quoiqu'à demi ordinairement. Mais il y a eu aussi des protestants de différentes branches rationalistes ou mystiques qui ont poussé les conséquences au delà du christianisme. Il n'y a que votre orthodoxie qui est libre de tout reproche: mais elle est vraiment ce qu'il y a de plus inconséquent et de moins orthodoxe à tous les egards. Voila ce qu'il me semble!

1.2) La théologie de votre école me paraissait occuper une position centrale dans la doctrine protestante moderne. Fruit d'une longue évolution scientifique, elle a developpé les conséquences des principes fondamentaux de la réforme, de son idéalisme subjectif. Elle a démontré que tout objectivisme en matière de religion, toute foi en une rédemption objective

– est du catholicisme et mène vers le catholicisme – l'église objective. Vous êtes les vrais pères antignostiques de la réforme (néokantiens, sans toujours le vouloir comme les autres étaient néoplatoniciens), et ce que je vous reprocherais (le premier peut être) c'est le trop d'orthodoxie protestante. Comme réforme théologique – c'est assurément ce qui a été fait de plus important depuis Luther. Mais comme oeuvre religieuse – la théologie Ritschlienne ne me parait être ni réformee, ni luthérienne, malgré la doctrine évangelique du royaume de Dieu et le piétisme épuré et sincère de sa conception fondamentale. Jugez si j'ai besoin d'être eclairé!

1.3) Plus je pense et plus il me semble, que le christianisme protestant pourra difficilement se contenter de cette théologie, malgrè la valeur scientifique de son empirisme historique. La doctrine de Ritschl manque assurément de plusieurs éléments, essentiels au protestantisme évangelique (sans parler des autres confessions, que je crois tout autant évangeliques). Je ne veux pas parler ici de "l'inconséquence chretienne" du protestantisme, de ce minimum catholique, sans lequel il n'a jamais su se constituer (ce n'est pas les inconséquences que je reproche aux confessions). Et je ne puis détacher l'avenir du protestantisme de celui des autres confessions, qui par le seul fait de leur existence l'obligent toujours à se constituer en église et d'être plus catholique qu'il ne le voudrait. (Sorte de fatalité, qui condamne le vrai protestantisme à un ésoterisme involontaire!)

1.4) Je veux parler ici d'un élément protestant par excellence qui manque complètement à Ritschl: le pessimisme religieux, la conscience profonde du mal et du pêché. Je sais que sur ce point vous ne partagez pas tout à fait les idées de Ritschl. Mais sa conception absolument empirique et nominaliste (j'alais dire pélagienne) du peché – n'est pas un détail de son systême: c'est un point essentiel, articulus stautis et cadeutis doctrinae. Car ce n'est qu'avec une pareille conception du pêché - qu'on peut nier si hardiment toute rédemption objective.

1.5) Pour vos reformateurs, ainsi que pour les grands penseurs allemands, le mal était plus qu'un

phénomène; et ce n'était pas quelque chose de purement négatif (absence d'amour ou de foi, comme ils l'ont parfois défini). Ils ont compris le mal, pour ainsi dire, positif, ils ont l'existence du pêché originel comme essence de notre volonté, précédant toute activité de la conscience individuelle; ils ont reconu ce fait inexplicable mais réel d'un royaume du mal. Et c'est pour cela que la rédemption n'a jamais encore été comprise comme un phénomène purement psychologique – une pacification de la conscience humaine seulement. Car elle doit être aussi la reconciliation de Celui, qui hait le pêché, avec ceux qui sont les enfants du pêché. Comme Dieu, dont l'homme se sent privé, n'est pas un phenomène, le pêché n'en est pas un dans sa racine, et les portes de l'enfer ne sont pas plus visibles que celles du paradis. Or si le pêché est en quelque sorte métempirique (Ursünde, Erbsünde als Grenzbegriff) – la rédemption doit l'être aussi. Le déracinnement du mal, la défaite de l'enfer ne peut se réduire à un phenomène psychologique et la paix même de notre conscience est notre foi absolue dans le Sauveur, dans l'accomplissement divin de la rédemption.

1.6) D'ailleurs Dieu et l'âme ne sont pas phénomènes, ce qui sera toujours la limite du subjectivisme religieux. J'entends bien, que le nominalisme moderne est plus conséquent que celui de la scholastique du XVI sciècle. Mais c'est que Luther a érigé en critère de religion la sola fides et non pas le nominalisme (au quel il n'avait recours que dans ses moments fâcheux). La foi vit de Dieu et de l'autre monde, elle se nourrit du “pain celeste”; elle est transcendente, parce qu'elle dépasse le monde. Une théorie de connaissance a peu de chose à lui apprendre et aucuns souvenirs ne sauraient l'ébranler, car elle renferme en soi une science vraiment sûre et divine. Elle embrasse Dieu et l'homme, elle comprend le pardon et le pêché. Et plus connait Dieu – le Père eternel et vivant dans son Fils bieu-aimé, plus elle voit l'immensité du pêché, de l'impurité humaine et de la miséricorde divine. Vous savez mieux que personne, comment cette science de Dieu et du pêché, du pardon et de Dieu – forme un seul tout indivisible, dont la richesse est infinie et qui se déroule devant le chrétien comme un royaume de gloire.

1.7) Mais c'est précisément dans cette science, que la divinité éternelle de notre Seigneur Jésus Christ est comprise, ainsi que le mystère de la croix et de l'incarnation. Les chrétiens se représentent la rédemption comme accomplie dans le sacrifice de l'Homme-Dieu. Leur doctrine, ou bien leur culte témoignent de leur foi dans ce mystère, cet acte divin qu'ils appellent ainsi. Et c'était jusqu'à présent un des gages les plus chers et touchants de l'unité chrétienne persistant dans la division.

1.8) Vraiment la théologie moderne n'a pas la science de cette foi! Et vous avez tort d'appeler spéculation cette théologie de la croix et de la crêche, qui bien certainement défie toute philosophie. Elle ne peut, ni ne veut expliquer ce mystère d'une façon rationelle; parce qu'elle le comprend dans la foi, elle l'adore, elle vit en lui. Mais quand on l'oblige à professer sa foi, elle répond que Dieu, qui est le très saint, - hait le péché, qu'il le maudit et le réprouve. Et en même temps, que le Père éternel a manifesté toute sa justice et toute la profondeur de sa miséricorde dans son Fils bien-aimé, qui est descendu dans l'abime du péché, a pris sa réprobation sur Lui, est devenu une malédiction pour nous (c'est ainsi que j'entends Matt XXVII, 46 et Marc XV, 34) et d'enfants du péché nous a baptisé enfants de Dieu.

1.9) Ce que je dis là, n'est ni de la philosophie, ni une phrase stéréotype, que je répète; mais c'est l'évangile, la bonne nouvelle si souvent défigurée par des raisonnements impies et des commentaires absurdes. Ce n'est ni une satisfaction juridique, ni une dette payée pour les hommes à Dieu ou au prince du mal, ce n'est pas même une délivrance des peines, des supplices des hommes que j'apperçois dans la croix: mais une manifestation d'amour absolument divine, infiniment supérieure au péché, au mal, à l'enfer. De sorte que si le mal persiste, il est absolument vaincu, dépassé et jugé. Car c'est aussi la manifestation du jugement, que le Père a confié au Fils.

1.10) Ainsi on a vraiment raison de dire que la théodicée de la croix – la seule vraie – a revelé au monde l'infinie sainteté de Dieu. Elle a fait que le mal est plus que compensé (felix culpa!) Et

c'est pour cela que la croix est le symbole de notre rédemption complète, de notre adoption, sanctification, de la conquête du monde, de toute notre foi, enfin. C'est la paix pour les hommes et la gloire, le triomphe inatendu pour les cieux mêmes où un chant nouveau a retenti – une revélation nouvelle pour toute la créature, qui lui fait comprendre la Divinité infiniment plus grande et plus sainte et nous laisse pénétrer dans l'insondable profondeur de l'Amour. C'est ainsi que Dieu a répondu au mal, c'est ainsi qu'il l'a jugé. Et toutes les théodicées me paraissent bien faussés et bien plattes à côté de celle-ci.

1.11) Athanase, Léon, Luther et bien d'autres encore ont bien parlé de la divinité et de l'humanité du Christ sans spéculer sur ses natures. Leurs conçeptions du christianisme etaient bien différentes, mais ils avaient “la science divine”. Voyons un peu , voudriez-vous nous l'enlever à nous autres catholiques et protestants et le pourriez vous? Mais en même temps je ne vois pas comment pourriez vous nous l'accorder, nous la permettre seulement?

1.12) Vous dites que nous devenous païens ou athées, hellènes ou barbares malgrè cette foi, à laquelle nous prétendous. Et vous avez raison, car si chaque confession nous mène par ses sentiers vers le Chef de la foi, chacune a ses chemins pour nous en égarer. Et j'en reviens à la parole de Ritschl que vous aimez à citer: que celui qui a une confession est comme s'il ne l'avait pas.

1.13) Après tout ça vous vous dites bien certainement, que j'abuse de votre patience et vous me demandez ce que je veux savoir? Je veux tout simplement savoir si je me trompe au sujet de la théologie protestante moderne et si vos adversaires orthodoxes ont une raison contre vous en même temps que vous avez une raison contre eux. Je veux savoir si les inconséquences confessionelles sont vraiment radicales et si je les vois bien.

1.14) Adieu mon cher maître, je vous demande pardon de vous avoir fatigué si longtemps, mais j'espère le faire encore une fois à Berlin à la mi-Septembre. Mes salutations respectueuses à

Mme Harnack, que ma femme salue a chaleureusesment.

Votre dévoué

Serge Trubetzkoy

English version

1891 3,7 Kreuznach Hôtel du Nord

1.1) We have just arrived in Kreuznach, after a long stay in Dinard. My wife and children are fine, thank God, and we hope to return to Russia soon and see you while passing through Berlin. I will enjoy with great pleasure our stay in Kreuznach in order to visit Giessen and Marburg, although I am afraid to find no one there this month. And that is why I am addressing you, dear Sir, begging you to give me the address of some of your colleagues who I can hope to find for the moment. You would be very good and kind enough to give me this information, for I really need to see Protestant theologians and philosophers. The enveloping darkness of matters of prime importance is gathering around me at every step, and I count on you to enlighten me, because it is you who have explained to me most the historical genius of Protestantism. But the result to which I arrive seems strange to me, and I confess it to you with a certain fear. It seems to me that the solution or rather the explanation of the eternal contradictions of Protestantism is this - that it is always and necessarily inconsistent and everywhere divided. It seems to me that you are right against your "conservatives" and that they too are right against you; almost every party logically, historically right. I will say even “that they are church-historically right”. I know well that the conceptions of Christianity in

our church or that of the Roman church imply contradictions that show us their imperfections. And the more they are pushed to the end, the more consistent they are, the less they appear to be Christian. But contradictions do not hinder their inner unity. It is rather the logic of things, the consequent orthodoxy that produces schisms. As for Protestantism – according to its nature, it cannot be schismatic; or rather all its schisms are internal divisions. But so far, and in all its divisions, Christian Protestantism seems to me still less consistent than the two Catholic churches. And for good reason, if it wanted to be consistent, it would be less Christian. Moreover the experience in it has often been accomplished, although half as commonly. But there were also Protestants from different rationalist or mystical branches who pushed the consequences beyond Christianity. There is only your orthodoxy that is free from reproach, but it is truly the most inconsistent and least orthodox in all respects. This is what it seems to me!

1.2) The theology of your school seemed to me to occupy a central position in the modern Protestant doctrine. Fruit of a long scientific evolution, it has developed the consequences of the fundamental principles of the reform, of its subjective idealism.[3] It has demonstrated that all objectivism in matters of religion, all faith in objective redemption - is Catholicism and leads to Catholicism - the objective church. You are the true anti-gnostic fathers of the reform (Neokantians without always wanting to be, in the same way as the others were Neo-Platonists), and what I would reproach you for (perhaps first) is too much Protestant orthodoxy. For theology of the reformation - this is certainly what has been most important since Luther. But as a religious work - Ritschlian theology seems to me neither Reformed nor Lutheran, in spite of the evangelical doctrine of the kingdom of God and the pure and sincere pietism of its fundamental conception. Judge if I need to be enlightened!

1.3) The more I think, the more it seems to me that Protestant Christianity can hardly be content with this theology, despite the scientific value of its historical empiricism. The doctrine of

3 Contrasted with Trubetskoi's 'concrete idealism'.

Ritschl certainly lacks several elements essential to Evangelical Protestantism (not to mention other confessions, which I believe to be equally evangelical). I do not want to speak here of the "Christian inconsistency" of Protestantism, of this catholic minimum, without which it has never known how to be constituted (it is not the inconsistencies for which I reproach confessions). And I cannot detach the future of Protestantism from that of other denominations, which by the mere fact of their existence always compel it to be a church and to be more catholic than it would like. (A kind of fatality, which condemns true Protestantism to an involuntary esoterism!)

1.4) I want to speak here of a Protestant element par excellence which Ritschl completely lacks: religious pessimism, deep awareness of evil and sin. I know that on this point you do not quite share Ritschl's ideas. But his absolutely empirical and nominalist (I mean Pelagian) conception of sin is not a detail of his system: it is an essential point, *articulus stantis et cadentis doctrinae*.[4] For it is only with such a conception of sin that one can so boldly deny any objective redemption.

1.5) For your reformers, as well as for the great German thinkers, evil was more than a phenomenon; and it was not something purely negative (lack of love or faith, as they have sometimes defined it). They understood evil, so to speak, positively; they have the existence of original sin as the essence of our will, preceding all activity of individual consciousness; they recognized this inexplicable but real fact of a realm of evil. And that is why redemption has never been understood as a purely psychological phenomenon - a pacification of human consciousness only. For it must also be the reconciliation of the One who hates sin with those who are the children of sin. As God, of whom man feels himself deprived, is not a phenomenon, sin is not one in its root, and the gates of hell are no more visible than those of paradise. But if the sin is somehow meta-empirical (Original sin, original sin as a limiting term) - redemption must be too. The uprooting of evil, the defeat of hell cannot be reduced to

4 'articulated as a doctrine by which the system stands or falls'.

a psychological phenomenon, and the very peace of our conscience is our absolute faith in the Saviour, in the divine fulfilment of redemption.

1.6) Besides, God and the soul are not phenomena, which will always be the limit of religious subjectivism. I understand that modern nominalism is of more consequence than that of the scholasticism of the sixteenth century. But it is because Luther has made *sola fides* a criterion of religion and not nominalism (which he used only in his regrettable moments). Faith lives from God and from the other world, it feeds on the "heavenly bread"; it is transcendent because it goes beyond the world. A theory of knowledge has little to teach it, and no memory can shake it, for it contains in itself a truly sure and divine science. It embraces God and man, it understands forgiveness and sin. And the more it knows God - the eternal Father and living in His beloved Son, the more it sees the immensity of sin, human impurity and divine mercy. You know better than anyone how this science of God and of sin, of forgiveness and of God - forms one indivisible whole, whose wealth is infinite and unfolds before the Christian as a kingdom of glory.

1.7) But it is precisely in this science that the eternal divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ is understood, as well as the mystery of the cross and the incarnation. Christians regard redemption as accomplished in the sacrifice of the God-Man.[5] Their doctrine, or their worship, testifies to their faith in this mystery, this divine act as they call it. And it has so far been one of the dearest and most touching pledges of persistent Christian unity in the division.

1.8) Truly, modern theology does not have the science of this faith! And you are wrong in calling speculation the theology of the cross and the manger, which certainly defies all philosophy. It cannot, nor does it wish to explain this mystery in a rational way; because [theology] understands it in faith, adores it, and lives in it. But when [theology] is forced to profess its

5 It seems likely that Trubetskoi is thinking here of the Russian term *bogochelovek*, translated into English as God-Man. The use of this term is a point of contention with Harnack.

faith, it replies that God, who is the most holy, hates sin, condemns it, and reproves it. And at the same time, that the eternal Father manifested all his righteousness and all the depth of his mercy in his beloved Son, who descended into the abyss of sin, took reprobation upon Himself, became a curse for us (Matt. 27:46 and Mark 15:34) and has baptised us the children of sin as children of God.

1.9) What I am saying here is neither philosophy nor a phrase as a stereotype, which I repeat; but it is the gospel, the good news so often disfigured by impious reasoning and absurd commentaries. It is neither a legal satisfaction nor a debt paid for men to God or the prince of evil, it is not even a deliverance from the sorrows, the tortures of men that I see in the cross: but a manifestation of absolutely divine love, infinitely superior to sin, to evil, to hell. So that if the evil persists, it is absolutely defeated, surpassed and judged. For it is also the manifestation of judgment, which the Father entrusted to the Son.

1.10) So we are right to say that the theodicy of the cross - the only true one - has revealed to the world the infinite holiness of God. It made it that the evil was more than compensated for (*felix culpa*!) And that is why the cross is the symbol of our complete redemption, our adoption, sanctification, the conquest of the world, and finally of all our faith. It is peace for men and glory, the unexpected triumph for the very heavens where a new song has sounded - a new revelation for the whole creature, which makes him understand the Divinity as infinitely greater and holier and lets us penetrate into the insuperable depth of Love. This is how God responded to evil, this is how he judged it. And all the theodicies seem to me very distorted and very flat next to this one.

1.11) Athanasius, Leo, Luther and many others have spoken well of the divinity and humanity of Christ without speculating on his natures. Their conceptions of Christianity were very different, but they had "the divine science". Let us see a little, would you take it from us Catholics and Protestants and could you? But at the same time I do not see how you could

grant it to us, only allow it to us?

1.12) You say that we become pagans or atheists, Hellenes or barbarians, despite this faith, to which we claim. And you have reason, because if each confession leads us by its paths to the Head of the Faith, each one has its ways to lead us astray. And I come back to the word of Ritschl that you like to quote: that he who has a confession is as if he did not have it.

1.13) After all that you will very certainly say that I abuse your patience and you will ask what I want to know? I just want to know if I'm wrong on the subject of modern Protestant theology and if your orthodox opponents have a reason against you and at the same time if you have a reason against them. I want to know if the confessional inconsistencies are truly radical and if I see them well.

1.14) Farewell my dear master, I beg your pardon for having tired you for so long, but I hope to do it once more in Berlin in mid-September. My respectful greetings to Mrs. Harnack, whom my wife greets warmly.

Your devoted

Sergei Trubetskoi

Letter 2 (Kreuznach, 27th August 1891)

This letter is dated 27th August at the end, but no year is given. Nonetheless, it is clearly connected to the previous letter, which would suggest it is also from 1891. Firstly, Trubetskoi is still in Kreuznach. Secondly he refers to recent visits to Marburg and Giessen, which

according to the previous letter, he is planning. Thirdly, he mentions giving Harnack trouble with a substantial letter (the first letter?), to which it is clear that Harnack had written a substantial response. The purpose of the present letter is to give a response to Harnack's letter. It is unfortunate that Harnack's letter appears to no longer survive. Finally, he refers to people he has met in Kreuznach, presumably contacts that he requested from Harnack in the previous letter.

2.1) Je vous remercie bien cher Monsieur pour votre longue et instructive lettre, ainsi que pour vos recomandations, dont je n'ai malheureusement pu profiter aussitôt, atteint d'une légère influenza, qui m'a retenu une semaine à Kreutznach. Je reviens de mon petit voyage de Marburg et Giessen ou je n'ai trouvé que M. Gottschick, qui à eté bien aimable pour moi et m'a charmé par son accueil. Prof. Herrmann etait parti. Je vous demande bien pardon de la peine, que je vous ai donné à me répondre, tout fatigué que vous étiez. Et quoique j'aurais bien voulu vous voir encore une fois à Berlin, j'espère ne pas vous y trouver, car vous avez vraiment besoin de repas.

2.2) Je prends encore une fois la plume pour expliquer quelques malentendus. Croyez vous vraiment que je méconnaisse l'importance profonde de votre criticisme théologique pour le protestantisme, pour la chretienneté en général? Ou bien me croyez-vous assez naïf et présomptueux pour vouloir m'exercer dans la polémique? Si vous avons besoin d'une polémique religieuse c'est bien contre notre orthodoxie, à nous. Quant au protestantisme, je pense que nous avons besoin de le connaître pour apprendre à le respecter chez nous et ailleurs et pour savoir mieux nous juger nous mêmes. En l'étudiant je n'ai pas d'autre but. Mais n'est-il pas bien naturel que je ne le comprenne pas, grec que je suis, une fois que tant de protestants le comprennent si peu? Je vous suis particullièrement reconnaissant, quand vous me prevenez contre les dangers d'une appréciation trop abstraite, trop "philosophique" des partis religieux-danger auquel je suis naturellement exposé, quoique je ne cherche nullement

dans les contradictions la fin de la sagesse.

2.3) Vous me dites que les faits prouvent qu'il n'y a pas de contradictions entre les partis, mais seulement des “spannungen”. Puisse-t-il en être ainsi entre les partis comme entre les confessions! Mais les faits ne peuvent pas prouver l'absence des contradictions; ils nous prouvent seulement qu'elles ne sont pas toujours senties. Dans notre cas elles ne le sont que trop, cas vos “orthodoxes” vous taxent d'hérésie et vous les taxez d'hypocrisie ou bien de catholicisme, permettant à quelques élus seulement la “poésie” de la foi ancienne.

2.4) Et quand nous en venons aux confessions différentes l'opposition s'accentue. Je ne puis vraiment comprendre qu'il soit nécessaire d'être un saint, un gnostique, un prophète – un virtuose enfin - pour croire dans la divinité éternelle de Jésus, son incarnation, sa rédemption objective. Je saie que des centaines de générations chrétiennes, ainsi que nos millions de moujiks – les plus humbles chrétiens qui existent – ont en cette foi, qui s'exprimait dans des images mystiques – plus naïves et inadéquates encore que nos abstractions dogmatiques – mais efficaces, vivantes et vraies quant au Christ. Vous me dites que je vous parle de la souveraineté du dogme ancien. Mais la rédemption, comme je l'entends, le Christ, la croix, ne sont pas des dogmes pour moi: c'est la foi, l'evangile. Et nous sommes plus portés à croire aux images qu'aux dogmes!

2.5) Vous me parlez ensuite de l'abime hideux qui nous sépare, de notre ignorance de l'histoire, qui est pour ainsi dire principielle. Je suis bien prêt à reconnaitre nos torts, qui sont ceux de toute orthodoxie; croyez-que je m'en ressens! Mais vous dites, que nous dispensons de définir ce que c'est que le christianisme et ce qui est chrétien. Et moi je vous demande, est-ce une question religieuse ou scientifique (théologique ou historique)? Si ce n'est qu'une question de foi – je pense que chaque croyant y répond. Si c'est une question historique je ne crois pas que vous même, le premier des historiens de l'église puissiez y répondre d'une façou suffisante. Sans mépriser la raison et la science, je pense qu'elles sont toujours limiteés et qu'on n'a pas

besoin d'être philosophe ou historien pour avoir le droit de s'appeller chrétien.

2.6) J'oserai vous poser ici une question qui certainement vous paraitra ridicule: la conception historique du christianisme est-elle la vraie conception chrétienne et n'y a-t-il pas une petitio principii dans l'affirmative? D'ailleurs, où est cette "conception historique"? Ce qu'il y a de plus important, le point de départ de l'historien – son appréciation du Christ et de son oeuvre est toujours apriorique et par taut indépendante de l'histoire. Toute notre appréciation de l'histoire dépend ainsi non seulement de nos connaissances historiques, mais aussi de notre conception première du Christ, c'est à dire de notre position religieuse (ou bien de notre irréligion). Or notre religion subit toujours des influences confessionnelles; et l'irréligion méconnait ce qu'il y a de plus essentiel dans notre histoire, car il faut croire pour la comprendre. La science peut elle modifier notre position religieuse? Jusqu'à un certain point – oui. Mais d'une part cette science historique est elle même dépendante de notre position religieuse, et d'autre part il y a des positions religieuses, qui sont tellement historiques en elles mêmes, qu'elles se laisserout difficillement réformer par une science nécessairement incomplète. La science historique peut nous delivrer de mainte tradition fausse; mais peut elle s'eriger en critère absolu de la tradition – en taut que cette tradition embrasse des idées religieuses, dont la reconnaissance et l'appreciation sont necessairement aprioriques indépendantes de l'histoire?

2.7) C'est une question pour moi, surtout quand je vois que les meilleurs ouvrages d'histoire chretienne sont toujours dominés par quelque idée religieuse. Et j'en vois certainement un exemple bien éclatant dans votre admirable Dogmengeschichte – une des expressions les plus nobles de la science et de la théologie protestante. Mais – si j'étais rationaliste – j'aurais dis que vous parter d'une image trop idéalisée de l'evangile primitif, que vous le stérilisez de ses elements théurgiques – de son pneumatisme realiste, pour ne voir qu'une infiltration posterieure dans le développement de ces élements, qui germaient dans le sein même de l'Urchristenthum. L'infiltration n'est pas à nier, comme dans tous les procès de croissance, de

nutrition, d'evolution organique. Mais on se demande justement si c'est une synthèse organique ou chimique seulement.

2.8) Il est absolument clair, que la théurgie était intimement liée à l'évangile du royaume – dans la représentation des premiers chrétiens; dans leurs croyances elle occupait une place plus importante qu'à la suite, quand elle a été refoulée au second plan par le développement de la mystique speculative et pratique, qui a pour ainsi dire absorbé en soi le réalisme pneumatique des conceptions primitives. Maintenant – de l'appréciation religieuse de ce réalisme – dépend nécessairement une certaine conception de l'histoire, qui l'a suivie. Vous appelez payennes (païennes) les idées de l'incarnation, d'une rédemption objective (sacrifice); d'autant plus les représentations “grossières” des “forces” “physiques” et “sacrées”, des “graces” de Jesus, de sa “corporéité mystique” etc. - qui mènent à l'idolatrie du Christ sacrement.

2.9) Et pourtant, historiquement vous ne pouvez nier, que tous les éléments de ces représentations, que j'appelle théurgiques se trouvent dans nos évangiles, et cela – dans l'union la plus intime avec l'image du Christ et avec les idées évangéliques du royaume et de l'absolution. C'est une impression que tous les enfants, tous les simples ont en premier lieu de l'evangile: il a été preché par la parole et par les miracles, par la sagesse et par la puissance, on le “voyait” et on l'entendait. On le voyait et on le croyait. Si la religion de second ordre n'existait pas c'est qu'elle était indissolublement confondre avec celle du premier. Jésus appuyait ses paroles par des prodiges, prouvait par leur moyen son pouvoir de pardonner les péchés, d'enfreindre lu loi du sabbat – ainsi que toute sa mission, l'evangile du royaume. Et il envoyait ses apôtres prêcher l'evangile et guérir les malades. Il était bien, l'homme attesté par les miracles (Actes II:22) pour le peuple, les apôtres, les disciples de Jean-Baptiste. Les oeuvres que le Père Lui a donné à accomplir et qui temoignent du Fils – faut partie intégrante de l'Evangile. Et j'affirme qu'elles ont dans nos évangiles une signification générale, qu'elles renferment une idée, une représentation particullière du Christianisme, de l'oeuvre du Christ, et que cette représentation, tout en étant historiquement bien evangélique ne rentre pas tout a fait dans les

cadres du protestantisme moderne. Vous me direz que ce sont là des enthusiastisch producirte Thatsachen: soit – d'autant plus générale etait l'idée à laquelle elles correspondaient, la disposition d'esprit qui les produisait. Certes tous ces miracles et prodiges, vrais ou legendaires palirent bientôt devant la resurrection, puis devant la conscience de plus en plus claire de la divinité du Christ. Mais ne faut il pas voir dans ces croyances théurgique, réalistes – si fortement developpées, si naturelles – un élément, une force élémentaire du christianisme primitif et puis – un facteur du mysticisme postérieure dans ses deux branches – le culte et le dogme? Quand on se rappelle l'enthusiasme primitif, le mysticisme theocratique, l'eschatologie, le chiliasme quand on pense à toute la religion de la resurrection - le "realisme pneumatique" nous parait bien historique. C'est sur lui que le gnosticisme a tenté de se greffer – ce qui un éxplique son developpement si spontané, son danger si grave et si general. Ah, si j'etais rationaliste je crois que j'aurais pu vous dire cela, tout comme je le fais en étant grec! Que s'en suit il? Premièrement que vous ne voudriez pas regler votre définition de ce qui est chretien d'après la conception historiquement primitive et que cela est tout simplement impossible. Vous me direz peut être que c'est justement l'histoire qui nous enseigne de distinguez nettement entre le chamanisme et le christianisme, de faire la part des représentations populaires des temps barbares et de ne pas confondre la vraie nouvelle de l'evangile avec ses formes passagères. Je le sais, mais il en est de même des représentations populaires et scientifiques de nos temps eclairés, dont il faut aussi savoir distinguer l'evangile et le Christ.

2.10) Ah Monsieur! Je crois bien que la manière de voir "historique" vous est bien flatteuse, car vous vous appercevez ou faut d'une échelle ascendante – comme les derniers, devenant les premiers! Quant à nous – pour nous consoler, nous n'avons qu'a nous imaginer une échelle descendente en vous placant tout au fond de l'abime, à la façons de nos polémistes orthodoxes. Et puisque la méthode "historique" nous est défavorable, il faut bien que nous devenions "anti-historiques" en mettant notre christianisme au dessus de toute histoire. Mais n'y a t il pas une troisième manière de voir, qui soit vraiment chrétienne et qui rende à Dieu et

à Cesar, aux confessions et à l'histoire – ce qui leur est du? Vous envisagez les confessions comme trois générations successives (trois moments) dont la dernière seulement, possédant une vie réelle, est un organisme vivant. Moi je pense que toutes les trois ont une existence simultanée et nécessaire, repondant à trois conceptions fondamentales du christianisme, qui sont vraies quoiqu'elles se soient développées séparément (j'entends la conception mystique, théocratique et subjectivement religieuse). Votre théorie de la succession des trois confessions est pour ainsi dire théogonique (l'ancien Uranus planant dans une sombre profondeur au dessus de la terre, qu'il veut pénétrer d'une étreinte éternelle et dans le sein de laquelle il plonge ses enfants - ce dieu châtré par un successeur plus jeune et refoulé aux confins du monde; puis Cronos, refoulé à son tour dans un "autre monde", dieu puissant et jaloux du pouvoir, engloutissant ses propres enfants et se croyant infaillible pour avoir une pierre dans son estomac; enfin Jupiter, qui dans un orage théogonique a délivré tout l'essaim des dieux nouveaux). Une conception théologique et pour ainsi dire trinitaire des trois confessions, qui appercevrait en elles trois forces vivantes, trois éléments du christianisme, ne serait elle pas plus religieuse et plus conforme à la verité? Je ne pense pas qu'elle soit en contradiction nécessaire avec l'histoire. Je sens la vie, la vraie et profonde foi, qui anime la plaine incense de notre église, que vous prenez pour un desert glacial. Et je ne crois pas que ce soient mensonge et violence qui cimentent la roche inébranlable de l'église romaine. Quant au protestantisme – je crois que je n'ai pas à refuter des accusations banales, une fois que je ne les ai pas repeté.

2.11) Il y a longtemps que je vous ai écrit cette lettre, mais je ne me decidais pas à vous l'envoyer: avant tout – de peur de vous envoyer et d'abuser de votre patience; ensuite de peur d'être mal dans ma pensée et mes intentions. Je vous souhaite de tout coeur paix, bonheur et prosperité dans votre nouvelle demeure, ainsi que le succès complet dans vos traveaux si grands et si importants. Mes salutations les plus respectueuses a Mme Harnack.

Votre dévoué

P.S. Dans trois semaines nous espérons être à Berlin.

Kreuznach 27 Aout.

English version

2.1) I thank you, dear Sir, for your long and informative letter, as well as for your recommendations, from which, unfortunately, I was not able to profit immediately, suffering from a slight flu, which detained me for a week at Kreuznach. I have just returned from my little trip to Marburg and Giessen, where I found only M. Gottschick, who was very kind to me and charmed me with his welcome. Prof. Herrmann was gone. I beg your pardon for the trouble I gave you to answer me, tired as you were. And although I would have liked to see you again in Berlin, I hope I do not find you there, because you really need meals.

2.2) I take the pen again to explain some misunderstandings. Do you really believe that I knew the profound importance of your theological criticism for Protestantism, for Christianity in general? Or do you think me so naive and presumptuous as to want to exercise in polemics? If you need a religious controversy it is against our orthodoxy. As for Protestantism, I think we need to know it to learn to respect it at home and elsewhere and to know how to judge ourselves better. By studying it I have no other goal. But is it not natural that I do not understand it, Greek that I am, since the Protestants seem to understand it so little? I am especially grateful to you when you warn me against the dangers of a too abstract, too

"philosophical" appreciation of the religious danger parties to which I am naturally exposed, although I am not seeking in contradictions the last word in wisdom.

2.3) You tell me that the facts prove that there are no contradictions between the parties, but only "tensions". May it be so between parties as between confessions! But the facts cannot prove the absence of contradictions; they only prove to us that they are not always felt. In our case they are only too many, if of your "orthodox" you tax heresy and you charge them with hypocrisy or Catholicism, permitting to a few only the "poetry" of the ancient faith.

2.4) And when we come to different denominations the opposition is accentuated. I cannot really understand that it is necessary to be a saint, a Gnostic, a prophet - a virtuoso in some way - to believe in the eternal divinity of Jesus, his incarnation, his objective redemption. I know that hundreds of Christian generations, as well as our millions of muzhiks - the most humble Christians who exist – have held in this faith, which was expressed in mystical images - more naive and inadequate than our dogmatic abstractions - but effective, alive and true to Christ. You tell me that I am talking to you about the sovereignty of ancient dogma. But redemption, as I understand it, Christ, the cross, are not dogmas for me: it is faith, the gospel. And we are more inclined to believe in images than in dogmas!

2.5) Then you speak to me of the hideous abyss which separates us, of our ignorance of history, which is, so to speak, principal. I am ready to acknowledge our wrongs, which are those of all orthodoxy; Believe me, I feel it! But you say that we dispense with defining what Christianity is and what is Christian. And I ask you, is it a religious or scientific question (theological or historical)? If it is just a question of faith - I think every believer answers it. If it is a historical question, I do not believe that you, the premier historian of the church, can answer it in a sufficient way. Without despising reason and science, I think they are always limited and that one does not need to be a philosopher or historian to have the right to call oneself a Christian.

2.6) I dare to ask you here a question which will certainly seem ridiculous to you: is the historical conception of Christianity the true Christian conception, and is there not a petitio principii in the affirmative? Besides, where is this "historical conception"? Most importantly, the starting point of the historian - his appreciation of Christ and his work is always aprioric and by itself independent of history. All our appreciation of history thus depends not only on our historical knowledge, but also on our first conception of Christ, that is to say our religious position (or our irreligion). But our religion is still subject to denominational influences; and irreligion misunderstood what is most essential in our history, for we must believe to understand it. Can science change our religious position? To a certain extent – yes. But on the one hand, this historical science is itself dependent on our religious position, and on the other hand there are religious positions, which are so historical in themselves, that they allow themselves to be reformed with difficulty by a necessarily incomplete science. Historical science can deliver us from many false traditions; but can it be erected as an absolute criterion of tradition - inasmuch as this tradition embraces religious ideas, the recognition and appreciation of which are necessarily independent of history a priori?

2.7) This is a question for me, especially when I see that the best works of Christian history are always dominated by some religious idea. And I certainly see a shining example in your admirable History of Dogma - one of the noblest expressions of Protestant science and theology. But - if I were a rationalist - I would have said that you leave a too idealized image of the primitive gospel, that you sterilize it from its theurgic elements - its realistic pneumatism, to see only a later infiltration into the development of these elements, which germinated in the very heart of primitive Christianity. Infiltration is not to be denied, as in all processes of growth, nutrition, organic evolution. But one wonders precisely if it is an organic or chemical synthesis only.

2.8) It is absolutely clear that theurgy was intimately connected with the gospel of the kingdom - in the representation of the early Christians; in their beliefs it occupied a more important

place than afterwards, when it was pushed back into the background by the development of speculative and practical mysticism, which, so to speak, absorbed in itself the pneumatic realism of primitive conceptions. Now - from the religious appreciation of this realism - necessarily depends a certain conception of history, which followed it. You call pagan the ideas of the incarnation, of an objective redemption (sacrifice); all the more the "vulgar" representations of the "physical" and "sacred" "forces", the "graces" of Jesus, of his "mystical corporeality" etc. - which lead to the idolatry of Christ the sacrament.

2.9) And yet, historically you cannot deny that all the elements of these representations, which I call theurgic, are found in our Gospels, and that - in the most intimate union with the image of Christ and with the evangelical ideas of the kingdom and absolution. It is an impression that all children, all the simple, have in the first place of the Gospel: it has been preached by word and miracles, by wisdom and by power, they could "see" it and hear it. They saw him and they believed him. If second-class religion did not exist, it is that it was indissolubly confused with that of the first. Jesus supported his words with wonders, proved by their means his power to forgive sins, to break the Sabbath law - as well as all his mission, the gospel of the kingdom. And sent his apostles to preach the gospel and heal the sick. He was good, the man attested by the miracles (Acts 2:22) for the people, the apostles, the disciples of John the Baptist. The works that the Father has given Him to do and which testify of the Son - must be an integral part of the Gospel. And I affirm that they have in our gospels a common meaning, that they contain an idea, a particular representation of Christianity, of the work of Christ, and that this representation, while historically very evangelical, does not fit all that is done in the framework of modern Protestantism. You will tell me that these are <u>enthusiastically produced facts</u>: - all the more widespread is the idea to which they corresponded, the disposition of mind that produced them. Certainly all these miracles and wonders, true or legendary, soon paled before the resurrection, and then before the ever clearer awareness of the divinity of Christ. But must we not see in these realistic theurgic beliefs - so strongly developed, so natural - an element, an elementary force of primitive Christianity, and then - a factor of later

mysticism in its two branches - worship and dogma? When one remembers primitive enthusiasm, theocratic mysticism, eschatology, chiliasm, when one thinks of all the religion of the resurrection - the "pneumatic realism" seems to us very historical. It is onto this that Gnosticism has attempted to graft itself - which explains its spontaneous development, its danger so grave and so widespread. Ah, if I was rationalist I think I could have told you that, just as I do in being Greek! What follows? Firstly, that you would not want to settle your definition of what is Christian from the historically primitive conception and that this is simply impossible. You may tell me that it is precisely history that teaches us to distinguish clearly between shamanism and Christianity, to take into account popular representations of barbaric times and not to confuse the true news of the Gospel with its temporary forms. I know this, but it is the same in popular and scientific representations of our enlightened times, whose gospel and Christ we must also know how to distinguish.

2.10) Ah sir! I believe that the way of seeing "historically" appeals to you greatly, because you see or need an ascending scale - like the last, becoming the first! As for us - to console us, we have only to imagine a descending scale by placing you at the very bottom of the abyss, in the manner of our orthodox polemicists. And since the "historical" method is unfavourable to us, we must become "anti-historical" by putting our Christianity above all history. But is there not a third way of seeing, which is truly Christian and which gives to God and to Caesar, to confessions and to history what is theirs? You see the confessions as three successive generations (three moments), only the last of which, having a real life, is a living organism. I think that all three have a simultaneous and necessary existence, responding to three fundamental conceptions of Christianity, which are true even though they have developed separately (I mean the mystical, theocratic and subjectively religious conceptions). Your theory of the succession of the three confessions is, so to speak, theogonic (the ancient Uranus hovers in a gloomy depth above the earth, which he wants to penetrate with an eternal embrace and in the bosom of which he plunges his children - this god castrated by a younger successor and exiled to the ends of the world, then Cronos, exiled in his turn in "another

world", powerful god and jealous of power, engulfing his own children and believing himself infallible, getting a rock in his stomach, and finally Jupiter, who in a theogonic upheaval delivered all the swarm of new gods). Would a theological and, so to speak, trinitarian conception of the three confessions, which perceives in them three living forces, three elements of Christianity, be not more religious and conform better to the truth? I do not think that it is in necessary contradiction with history. I feel the life, the true and deep faith, which animates the plain incense of our church, which you take for an icy desert. And I do not believe that lies and violence cement the unshakable rock of the Roman church. As for Protestantism - I think I do not have to refute trivial accusations since I have not repeated them.

2.11) It has been a long time since I wrote you this letter, but I did not decide to send it to you: first of all - for fear of abusing your patience by sending it to you; then for fear of being wrong in my thoughts and intentions. I wish you peace with all my heart, happiness and prosperity in your new home, as well as complete success in your substantial and significant works. My most respectful greetings to Mrs Harnack.

Your devoted

S. Trubetskoi

P.S. In three weeks we hope to be in Berlin.

Kreuznach 27th August.

Letter 3 (Dec. 1891/Jan. 1892?)

This letter is not dated. It was, however, written when Sergei Trubetskoi had already returned to Moscow. In the letter, he is still planning to visit Harnack in Berlin in the summer. We know that this plan did not come to fruition due to his daughter's ill health and call to work with those suffering from starvation in Ryazan region.[6] Indeed, as Ermishin remarks, 1892 marked a move away from Trubetskoi's purely philosophical interests towards increased social engagement. Since in the letter Trubetskoi wishes Harnack a happy New Year, either December 1891 or January 1892 would seem a probable date.

Moscou Arbat 23

Très honore cher Monsieur!

3.1) Je m'empresse de répondre à votre lettre que mon frère Eugène vient de me transmettre. C'est lui qui est l'auteur de l'ouvrage sur St. Augustin que vous avez reçu. Je voulais vous écrire pour prévenir cette erreur mais votre lettre m'a devancée. Mon frère nouvellement nommé professeur à Kiew est d'une année plus jeune que moi; nous avons fait vos études ensemble et il a commencé son livre lorsque j'étais à Berlin. Quant à moi depuis mon retour je n'ai pas encore fait d'ouvrage digue de vous être envoyé. J'en médite un pourtant et je compte vous en entretenir dans le courrant de cette année en passant par Berlin. Je suis bien touché du bon souvenir que vous me garder.

3.2) Ma famille va bien, mais les médecins nous recommandent un séjour près de l'océan pour ma petite, qui vient de subir une legère opération. Je vous souhaite la bonne année, à vous ainsi

6 Ермишин О. Т. Княз С. Н. Трубецкой. 18.

qu'a Mme Harnack et à vos enfants. Le bruit de vos luttes parvient jusqu'à nous, avec la lumière de vos récents travaux, dont je suis comme toujours le zèle lecteur. Je me réjouis de vous voir mariant si bien la science et la foi, tout en plaisant leur divorce. Puissiez vous toujours travailler avec le même succes et lutter avec paix pour l'oeuvre de votre foi.

3.3) Ma femme vous salue et se rappelle au bon souvenir de Mme Harnack, qu'elle espère aller voir à Berlin. Je me joins à elle pour la saluer.

Recevez le temoignage de ma sincère amitié.

votre devoué

prince Serge Troubetzkoy

(prof. à l'Univ de Moscou)

P.S. M. Schulze-Gavernitz est à Moscou et produit l'impression la plus sympathique sur tout le monde.

English version

Moscow Arbat 23

Most honoured dear Sir,

3.1) I hasten to reply to your letter that my brother Evgenii has just sent me. He is the author of the

work on St. Augustine that you have received. I wanted to write to you to prevent this error but your letter has preceded me. My brother who is newly appointed a professor in Kiev is a year younger than me; we did your studies together and he started his book when I was in Berlin. As for me since my return, I have not yet done any work to send you. I'm thinking about one, however, and I intend to talk to you about it in the course of this year, passing through Berlin. I am very touched by the good memory you have of me.

3.2) My family is fine, but the doctors recommend a stay near the ocean for my little girl, who has just undergone a simple operation. I wish you a Happy New Year, to you and to Mrs. Harnack and your children. The sound of your struggles reaches us, with the light of your recent labors, of which I am, as always, the zealous reader. I rejoice to see you marrying science and faith so well, while pleasing their divorce. May you always work with the same success and fight with peace for the work of your faith.

3.3) My wife greets you and has a good memory of Mrs Harnack, whom she hopes to see in Berlin. I join her in greeting her.

Receive the testimony of my sincere friendship.

your devoted

Prince Sergei Trubetskoi

(Professor of Moscow University)

P.S. M. Schulze-Gavernitz (German economist 1864-1943) is in Moscow and produces the most likeable impression on everyone.

Letter 4 (Dec. 1894?)

This, the only letter in German, is not dated, but refers to the death of Ivantsov-Platonov in the previous month. Since this church historian died in November 1894, the letter can reasonably be dated to December 1894.

Hochgeehrter Herr Professor!

4.1) Neben der Mittheilung dass der Moskauer Professor der Kirchengeschichte Иванцевъ-Платоновъ im vorigem Monate gestorben ist, wende ich mich mit eines Bitte an Sie. Die Verehrer und Freunde des Verstorbenen sam meln für seine Biographie bibliographische Materialen. Nun wäre es ihnen hichst wünschenswert zu erfahren wann und wo Sie Herr Professor seine Forschung über die Quellen der urchristlichen Ketzengeschichte recensirt haben? Ich hoffe Sie werden uns Ihre freundliche Auskunft darüber nicht versagen. Der Verstobene Moskauer Prof. war sehr beliebt und geschätzt. Beim Scheiden von uns war es sein Wunsch sein Lehramt einem Univeritätsgelehrten (d. h. Keinem geistlichen) zu vermachen.

4.2) Zugleich benutze ich die Gelegenheit Ihnen und Ihrer Frau Gemahlin meine Besten Neujahrswünsche zu überbringen. Mit innigstem Vergnügen und Dank erinnere ich mich oft meines Berliner Aufenthalts und Ihres freundlichen Verkehrs, in welchem ich sie so hoch schätzen lernte und so tiefe Anregungen zum Verständniss der protestantischen Wissenschaft erlangte.

4.3) In der Hoffnung, dass Sie die erbetene Auskunft mir baldgefällig zukommen lassen, ersuche

Sie zu entschuldigen dass ich Sie beunruhige Ihnen und Ihrer Frau Gemahlin die freundlichsten Grüsse von meiner Frau.

mit aller Hochachtung

Fürst Sergej Trubetzkoy

Moskau Arbat 47 (Haus d. gesellsch. russ. Aerzte)

English version

Highly honoured Professor!

4.1) Besides the communication that the Moscow Professor of Church history Ivantsov-Platonov died in the previous month, I am prompted to write to you with a request. The admirer and friend of the deceased collects for his biography bibliographic materials. It would now be highly desirable to learn from you when and where, you, Professor, have marked/included the sources of early Christian heretic-history? I hope you would not fail to get us your friendly information in addition. The deceased Moscow Professor was very popular and appreciated. On parting from us, it was his desire to bequeath his teaching to a university scholar (i.e. not clergy).

4.2) At the same time I take the opportunity to send to you and your lady wife my best New Year's wishes. With the deepest pleasure and gratitude I often recall my stay in Berlin and your friendly conduct, in which I appreciated you so highly, learned and gained profound ideas

from the understanding of Protestant science.

4.3) In the hope that you will soon send the requested information, I request you excuse that I have disturbed you and your wife, friendly greetings from my wife.

with all respect,

Prince Sergei Trubetskoi

Moscow Arbat 47 (House of the Russian Society of Doctors)